

JOHN M'LEOD CAMPBELL - THEOLOGIAN

His Theological Development and Trial
And a New Interpretation of His
Theory of the Atonement.

Thesis submitted for the Degree of Ph. D.

by

Eugene Garrett Bewkes, B.Sc., B.D.

Hooker-Dwight Fellow Yale Divinity School.

Degree conferred 17th July 1924.



Table of Contents.

Introduction.	1-vi
Chapter I.	
Religious Problems of the Row Ministry	1-18
Equipment for His Task - Freedom from Party Divisions - Experimental Method - Reaction Against Current Views on Repentance - Religious Effects of Calvinism - Attempt to Dispel Religious Stagnation - Attitude Toward Scripture.	
Chapter II.	
The Row Doctrines.	19-56
Universal Atonement	19
a. Nature of the Atonement at This Period	28
Universal Pardon	37
a. Relation of Universal Pardon to Repentance	42
b. Effects of Universal Pardon	46
Assurance as the Essence of Faith	48
Chapter III	
The Heresy Trial.	57-106
Preliminary Setting	57
Relation to the Marrow Controversy	61
The Westminster Confession in the Trial	72
The General Assembly Decides	91
The Amends of Later Years	104

Chapter IV

A Comparison Between Luther and Campbell on Faith	107-142
General Point of Contact	107
Luther's Doctrine of Faith	111
The Object of Faith - Faith's Response	
Justification by Faith - Effects of Faith	
The Advancement of Campbell Beyond Luther	128

Chapter V.

Antecedents to the Study of the Atonement	143-173
The Intellectual Approach to the Atonement	143
Criticism of Calvinism	153
The Character of Campbell's Book on the Atonement	164
Customary Classification of the Theory	167

Chapter VI.

The Theory of the Atonement	174-250
The Ends Contemplated in the Atonement	174
The Sufferings of Christ for Man	181
One Form in Which Suffering Love Communes with God	188
The Atonement as a Way into Sonship	211
Another Aspect of the Prayer of Love	222
Sonship as Salvation	228
Final Period of Christ's Suffering-Its Relation to Man	238
Conclusion of the Theory	247

Chapter VII.

E s t i m a t e 251-289

Critical Estimate of the Theory	251
Superiority to Atonement Interpretation of Schleiermacher	267
Difference between Campbell and Ritschl on Atonement	274

Chapter VIII.

The Influence of Campbell 290-323

Relation to R. C. Moberly	290
Vicarious Penitence in W. H. Moberly	305
Relation to Other Theories of Atonement	306
Influence Through "Thoughts on Revelation"	309
Testimony to Campbell's Theological Significance	318
Acknowledgement of Influence by Prominent Followers	319

Introduction.

The name of John M'Leod Campbell will be found among Scotland's best, with high rank in its theological nobility. In fact, Campbell is conceded to be by some, the theological mind of Britain of the Nineteenth Century. But the name of this thinker was not always to be found in the place of honour where it now stands. Who else within a space of forty years was so thoroughly cast out of church fellowship, and then so highly honoured? In youth he was found guilty of heresy; in old age he was robed with the highest theological honours. From heretic to saint, this record might be called, not because a man recanted, but because a church changed, and a people followed after.

Few men have been so completely misunderstood and so frequently associated with ideas and movements not at all their own. It took time, and several decades of time to undo some of the worst aspersions cast on Campbell and his work. One church history, that by John Cunningham 1859, in its references to Campbell, drew a most unfortunate and wholly incorrect caricature. This history linked Campbell with Irving and the "gift of tongues" movement saying, "Devout ladies who had learned religion from his lips, began to speak in unknown tongues and to talk about walking upon the sea." This is unpleasant reading to those who know Campbell. A closer investigation would have eliminated this misguided remark, for it would have shown that Campbell had no responsibility whatsoever for the strange religious phenomenon which sprang up simultaneously at Greenock

and Rosneath, close to Campbell's parish.

It would appear almost that the fates had intriqued to involve Campbell's name in the frenzied religious outburst which culminated in the formation of the "Holy Catholic Apostolic Church", sponsored by Irving. This flare in the theological firmament occurred just at the time when Campbell's heresy trial was the chief religious theme. It was purely a coincidence that Campbell's parish was so closely connected geographically with Greenock and Rosneath, and that meetings of the rising sect were actually held within the bounds of the Row Parish. However, it was easy to surmise the existence of a causal connection between the doctrines of Campbell and the extravagant utterances of the new "apostolic" movement. It took years for the popular mind to dissociate the name of Campbell from the Irving movement.

Opinion, however, did undergo a change, and a very striking illustration of this is to be seen in the contrasted statements taken from two books by the same author, the second of which was written twenty five years after the first. Dr. Hanna wrote the life of Thomas Chalmers, his father-in-law. In it he said of Campbell's trial for heresy, that to it "every member of the Church of Scotland may turn with pride when he desires proof of how readily false doctrine can be brought under review of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Court, and how promptly and faithfully the decision of that court can be given."

Twenty five years later, Dr. Hanna published the "Life and Letters of Thomas Erskine." In this volume, referring to the deposition of Campbell and his friend Scott, deposed by the same General Assembly, Dr. Hanna said, "Nearly half a century has

passed since then, and it is believed that the Church would now eject neither one nor the other. If so, there must have come over her some modifications either of her own belief in the whole doctrine of the Confession, or of her demand for an entire conformity therewith. It is certain that the Church is not standing now in the ground she occupied forty seven years ago, and the time may come ere long for her to acknowledge and indicate the change in her position."

Equally significant is the changed attitude, which in recent years has come about in connection with Campbell's later work, particularly that part of it dealing with the nature of the atonement. Campbell is being recognized, and his importance is more and more being taken for granted. Pfleiderer in his, "Development of Theology", placed Campbell and Erskine together as the leading British theologians of the Nineteenth Century. And Dr. Barbour in his recent life of Alexander Whyte, referred to Campbell as the preeminent Scottish theologian of the last century.

The progress and interpretation of this scholar's theological development will concern us in this thesis. This is the first serious attempt that has been made to present the work and teaching of Campbell in a systematic form. There is no book to which one can turn for a treatment of what Campbell has done in theology. When it is considered that there is hardly a book of importance on the atonement since his day which does not mention him, it does seem that an exposition of the present kind is called for. This is the more pressing in view of the recent references to Campbell's importance. The effort undertaken in

these chapters is an attempt to supply the need.

We shall start with the well trained minister who began his work in Row Parish. We shall deal with the religious problems which faced him there, and his diagnosis of the situation thus confronting him. And further, we shall trace the gradual emergence of those ideas which grew out of the current religious situation, and having emerged, led straight toward the trial for heresy. An account of the heresy trial is also a very necessary inclusion in view of the mistaken allusions which have frequently been made. Thus we shall be enabled to clear away some of the haze which envelops this early period in the life of Campbell. Moreover, the presentation of this historical situation will contribute to a better appreciation of the later years of his ripened thought. It is really a long journey from Campbell's youth at Row to the seasoned products of matured manhood, but even as the springtime prophecies the harvest, so Campbell's youth proclaimed a future greatness. This greatness rests on his, "The Nature of the Atonement". This volume is not the last of Campbell's works, but it is the masterpiece by which he will be remembered as long as there is Christian theology. We have made a new interpretation of this magnum opus, and in doing so, have departed widely from the customary classification of the theory.

The present treatment will deal with the theological side of Campbell's career alone. The writer intends to add later, a biographical section. It will not be a biography, but an attempt within a short compass to present an impression of the man as he was; to indicate something of the depth and quality

of his personality; to give a glimpse of him as the loved and honoured husband and father, and also to see him as the friend and correspondent of cultured men of influence. We cannot hope to do more than bring together a few materials for the imagination of the reader to work upon and create the character of the man. We should like to give some account of that long period of unheralded service in Glasgow about which so little is known; the years of which Campbell said, "I was a nobody in Glasgow." There was no popular acclaim through these years when Campbell poured himself out in an independent ministry without salary. During these unnoticed days of searching thought, he was yet close to life. From the constant mutual contact of creative mind and surging human life, there was wrought out, as on an anvil of God, the meaning of the Cross.

The intimate friend who contemplated the writing of a biography, did not live to begin it. This man could have painted the portrait we should like to have. He had the skill, the spiritual touch and the long contemporary years of close friendship. He would have put his heart in it, he said, for it would probably be his last work, and he wanted it to be his best. But Norman Macleod died three months later than the friend whom he revered.

Something of the character of Campbell, however, will be discernible in the present study. The legacy which Campbell left us in his interpretation of the life and work of Jesus Christ, could be written only by one having greatness of

character and depth of soul. We hope that the exposition here undertaken and especially the new handling of Campbell's treatise on the atonement, will be justified in the body of the discussion to which we now turn.

Chapter I.

Religious Problems of the Row Ministry.

It was a young man with a "devoted purpose of faithful laboring" who came to the Parish of Row in September 1825. This was no new resolution, but an expression of character already formed. He brought with him to this parish a brilliant mind, a love of beauty and of literature and a deeply religious spirit.

His training had been exceptional. From childhood he had breathed the atmosphere of culture. His active mind had enjoyed the advantages which a scholarly and broadminded father could give. Campbell was reading Caesar at eight years, and at fifteen and sixteen had taken prizes in Logic and Philosophy in the University of Glasgow.

Campbell entered the ministry with far greater equipment than the conventional requirements. After a most creditable university career, he entered the Divinity Department at Edinburgh University. To the required work of his student days he added Natural History, Political Economy and French. His keen thirst for knowledge is further illustrated by his attendance at lectures on Chemistry and Anatomy. Having finished his divinity course, Campbell continued for two years more to engage himself diligently in wide reading and study. He attended Sir William Hamilton's lectures and read philosophy with particular emphasis on the Scotch philosophers. We know that at this period he read Reid, Stewart, Brown and Hume. Butler's Analogy was also included in his reading at this time.

With such a background of thought, Campbell came to Row. He was much better prepared, from an intellectual and religious viewpoint than most of his contemporaries. We see as a result several interesting consequences. It gave to him an independence of mind, even perhaps a loneliness of spirit, for he found himself somewhat separated from his professional group. His desire to think for himself prevented him from taking sides in the theological divisions of the day. From the very first he refused to be aligned with either of the two parties of which the church of the day was composed.

The parties were the Moderates and the Evangelicals. The Evangelicals were the more strictly Calvinistic group. The Moderates desired to soothe the sting of rigid orthodoxy and emphasized the necessity for good works. Consequently the Moderates emphasized morality in their preaching, avoiding the intricacies of doctrine which did not satisfy them. On the other hand, the Evangelicals were engrossed with doctrine and the fostering of religious life through doctrinal faith and introspection. The Evangelical tradition had produced the religious problem which soon presented itself to the new minister. The Moderate position was intended as an offset to the rigor of the other side, but in emphasizing religion as morality it lost much of spiritual vitality. The party watchwords were, "Faith" and the other "Works". Campbell speaks of these opposite parties, "which seemed to themselves severally to side with St. Paul or St. James; or at least the one to read St. James by the light of St. Paul; the other to read St. Paul by the light of St. James."

Campbell saw beyond the party divisions of both groups. He

feared as he said, "that the fetters of party might interfere with free obedience to light." But he was convinced that party feeling tended to narrowness, "because the men of each party seemed to me doing injustice to what was good in the other, and to see its evil through a magnifying of party feeling." His conviction of the practical evils which had arisen from party feeling distinguished him from his contemporaries. He refused to be initiated into either of the opposed groups and thereby consigned himself to isolation and loneliness. And Campbell had to pay for his clear sightedness, for his decision had far reaching consequences. It is probable that Campbell would never have been deposed had he joined himself to either wing of the Church. When opposition arose against him, there were no party obligations at stake. Neither party felt any necessity to support a colleague. So both united in pushing him out, and then congratulated themselves on the fundamental unity which after all made both parties one in spirit. Campbell was crushed between the upper and nether millstones, but his liberated spirit was thus freed from all entanglements.

Another result of Campbell's intellectual and spiritual equipment was the experimental method which he brought to bear on his religious problems. The wide range of his early studies and the scientific attitude of mind which he had acquired, were to be of great use to him in facing the practical problems needing solution. They were of a peculiar kind, resultants of the current system of theology. We might expect from the keenness of his mind and the breadth of his training, that he would be dissatisfied with any theories which ran counter to the facts

of religious experience.

We do an injustice to the Row minister if we think of him as coming to Row with pet theories spun on some speculative loom in the students' quarter, or as having a pattern which life must fit, however awkward the fitting. He entered upon his task, "conscious of a single and strong desire to be the instrument of good to the flock over which I had been appointed overseer..." His theology was on the whole the Calvinism of the day. But this was hardly a part of himself. It was really not his own. However, he did possess and have already with him that profound sense of the love of God to men, "expressed through the gift of Christ", which is so characteristic and basic in all his thinking. Along with it was the recognition of the need for redemption¹. Religion was real to him. It was an experience. He had tasted of its fruit himself and had seen its effects in the lives of others, especially so in that of his father. It was the character of his father which gave to him his first appreciation of the Fatherhood of God. Religion meant life for him. Very early he said that, "the life of Christianity was experimentally to know it."

It is thus evident that Campbell had no theological axe to grind. The fact is that up to the time he definitely began his ministry, his pursuits had been more philosophical and scientific than theological. In order then for us to understand thoroughly the roots of Campbell's contribution to religious thought, it cannot be overemphasized that his theological thinking grew out of the practical work and experience of the ministry. The conclusions which set him apart from his contemporaries were not

¹ Reminiscences, page 11.

the deductions of speculative reasoning merely, but rather the inductions from the evidence of experience. The theological thinking which soon began to manifest itself at Row, was the effect of a cultured religious mind in contact with the religious conditions and experiences of the people. It is not easy to determine just what that mind contained or the influences which filtered into it. It is not so simple as measuring a cord of wood. Let us first see the man at work before we attempt to separate and account for the elements which made him what he was.

Campbell began to carry out earnestly the duties devolving upon him as minister of the parish. His work was a delight to him just because his religious life was such a part of him. He wanted every one to feel as he did that religion was not a topic to be shunned, but a full orb'd life to be lived. He noticed the reticence which people displayed when they expected the pastoral visit to be nothing but a sombre inquiry into the religious status of the household. He saw that the joy of the Christian life was missing, and Campbell was anxious to have religion take a more accredited place in the conversation and life of the people.

This was the beginning of his awakening to the fact that religion in the minds and hearts of his people was not properly understood. They were not really living it as a life, though they did indeed strive to fulfil its duties. The spontaneity and happiness of spiritual communion was not present. This was a puzzle to Campbell who sincerely meditated on this lack of religious vitality. The first awareness of where the real trouble lay, came to him in connection with the attitude observable in

regard to Repentance. ¹

Despite the recognized importance of Repentance, it was, in Campbell's opinion, very meagrely and superficially understood. There was genuine regret in Repentance, but it was, "regret for the personal evil consequences of having exposed oneself to the wrath of God." There was no "perception of the intrinsic excellence and beauty of holiness and love, and the intrinsic deformity and hatefulness of sin and selfishness." When men in grateful prayer acknowledged the goodness of God, it was formal rather than the spontaneous expression of hearts which were "full of His excellence and enamoured of His beauty."

Imbedded in the religious consciousness of the people there must be some responsible cause. Phrases such as, "Repent for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand", and "Flee from the wrath to come", bring into relief the attitude of mind behind Repentance. Repentance as it was now uncovered, was, despite its sincerity, wrongly conceived. It was too literally a fleeing from the wrath to come. It was too much regarded as the gate into a city of refuge, and too little as the doorway into the abundant life of fellowship with a God of love.

But this was only one of several related ideas rooted in the religious mind of the people. These ideas were closely linked and together made a religious complex difficult to solve. The fact that Campbell found a way and method of solution is of real importance to theology.

¹ Letter written 1831. Any material in this chapter which is derived from Rem. and Reflections, written in Campbell's old age, is in harmony with letters written at the Row stage. The chapter attempts to present the mind of Campbell during this period.

What Campbell observed in connection with Repentance was but the first step on what was to be a long trail of theological thinking. Campbell as a religious explorer, rather than as an adventurer, picked his way from stage to stage. He recorded his advances with fairly clear lines of demarcation. He did reach in the end a deeply spiritual and moral view of the nature of the Atonement, but it is of great importance to our study to know by what route he came and to see for ourselves the landmarks of his progress.

The overstressed emphasis on safety in Repentance, was but a symptom of an underlying lack of wholesome confidence in God. It was not in accord with what the Christian consciousness should be. So as a first effort, Campbell "laboured to combine the pressing of a high standard as to what God calls us to be, with an equally earnest pressing of the power of the Gospel to accomplish the will of God in us." But though this as a general statement sounds reasonable, it was not satisfactory, for the people were not feeling the power of the Gospel or understanding the nature of that power. In consequence Campbell found that this teaching was working out more as a law than as a Gospel, and the ideal was aspired to more in fear than in hope. "They were only having a demand on them to be - not hearing the divine secret of the Gospel as to how to be - that which they were called to be."

The parishioners did not have the comfort which comes from the personal apprehension of Christ. Their faith in Christ was really a "supposed faith" which consisted in empty words, "the form of an unrealized dogma, their holding of which availed them

nothing." And they too felt their lack of confidence and were very desirous of finding greater certainty. They felt there must be something which they could do to attain this confidence. Perhaps they could fulfil some condition which stood in the way, "conscious compliance with which would introduce them to the enjoyment of salvation." Some thought of this preliminary condition as Repentance, as faith or love or "being good enough." It was this last phrase, "being good enough," which Campbell decided was one of the root difficulties. Thus to them, "Christ was to be a reward of some goodness - not perfect goodness, but that which would sustain a personal hope of acceptance in drawing near to God. In this mind the Gospel was practically a law, and the call to trust in Christ only the condition of the demand which the law makes; an additional duty added to the obligation to love God and to love man; not the secret of the power to love God and to love man." They thought they must be busy doing something to get a mental warrant for believing they were saved. The kind of faith they had was belief only and it was not giving them a joyous confidence.

Campbell came to see this quite distinctly and laboured, "to fix their attention on the love of God revealed in Christ, and to get them into a mental attitude of looking at God to learn his feelings toward them, not at themselves to consider their feelings towards Him." They were still to be consistent in their admission of not being what they should be, but were cautioned that no blind effort on their part could make them what they ought to be. They were not to excite faith or induce it by effort. But they were shown the necessity of "coming under the natural power of

the love, the forgiving redeeming love which was set before them." Thus the endeavor was made to raise the people to the "apprehension of a love in God to us which is irrespective of what we are, and is sustained by the contemplation of what He both wills us to be and is able to make us." This is a considerable advance beyond the mere holding forth of a high standard and saying that the power of the Gospel can bring us up to it. For now the power of the Gospel is seen to be the all embracing love of God and life is to be lived under the natural power of that love.

Strong as this appeal was on earnest minds, holding out as it did glad tidings for freer faith, there was something which marred its full enjoyment.

Whatever the religious theory of the day may say for itself, the fact remains that Calvinism produced an effect which was a dampening of religious enthusiasm; a discouraging of assured confidence that the Christian was abiding in the joy and peace of God. Religious happiness and confidence were not too greatly encouraged. The natural joy of being at one with God was mixed with the alloy of fear; fear of self-deception; fear that faith was not of the right kind. Yet despite this tone of depression which existed, it was theoretically maintained that a simple trust in Christ warranted a confidence in God. However, this experience was reserved for special occasions or conditions as, "when uttered on a death bed," or the "expression of a freedom reached after a period of much distress on account of sin," or "attained after years of earnest religious living". Then men could rejoice in their confidence and be glad for it.

But, "how such peace and joy in believing should be safe on

a death bed and not safe in the fullest vigor of life....this it is difficult to understand looking at the elements of the faith in question simply in itself." Here again, however, it was admitted theoretically that it was possible for a man in the full possession of health to have this confidence, but practically as Campbell tells us, this "was held to be the happy distinction of a few." Self-deception; fear that faith was not really a saving faith was the pall which hid the glory of God.

This distrust and lack of confidence had a number of evil consequences. It had led to a regular system of testing faith in an effort to decide whether a given faith was a right faith. This was known as the system of "Evidences" by which one could, so to speak, approximate the height, breadth and depth of faith, and thus estimate its sufficiency to warrant confidence in it as an acceptable oblation. It was not quite so exact as a slide rule or a "T" square, but it was an accepted standard of measurement. It was another invention born of necessity.

We have observed that a confident belief that faith was genuine was not the common experience. In consequence dread fear often accompanied those who lacked this assurance. So the system of "Evidences," assuming that peace with God might not be experienced as the direct effect of faith; which faith might nevertheless be a saving faith, provided a means of testing that faith as to its genuineness or otherwise. The individual who thinks he has faith but does not have assurance is to ask himself if he really loves God. If so, his next move is to analyze himself and see if his life indicates love to man and shows forth the Christian graces. But too frequently the effect on the in-

individual who questioned the genuineness of his faith was discouraging. He was forced to examine his own life, to search himself introspectively and in consequence, if not self-righteously inclined, the ordinary mortal hardly dared to regard himself as a pillar of faith. The more sincere he was, the more depressed he became. So that this system of "Evidences," though intended to provide assurance, put the sincere seeker who was conscious of his sin, further than ever from the simplicity of Christian faith. The first dread fear regarding faith was not dispelled by multiplying the difficulties. In escaping from the club of Cyclops, faith sought shelter in the arms of an octopus and became hopelessly entangled.

Thus faith and assurance reached the impasse which a far seeing calculator might have foreseen from a study of Calvin's Institutes. Calvin associated assurance with faith. "We shall have a full definition of faith if we say that it is a firm and sure knowledge of the divine favour toward us founded on the truth of a free promise in Christ, and revealed to our minds and sealed on our hearts by the Holy Spirit."¹ But wholesome as this sounds, there were so many other factors introduced by Calvin as to faith, that faith was really robbed of its simplicity. This faith of which he speaks came to the elect alone. "The elect alone have that full assurance which is extolled by Paul and by which they are enabled to cry, Abba Father."² If a person was elect he would have assurance, but how be sure of Election, for "All are not created on equal terms, but some are

1. Institutes, Book III. Chap. II. sec. 7.

2. Institutes, Book III. Chap. II.

preordained to eternal life, others to eternal damnation and accordingly as each has been created for one or the other of these ends, we say that he has been predestinated to life or to death."¹ But even if an individual did manage to acquire saving faith, assurance might be banished by fears and terrors. We never completely overcome distrust, even if elect says Calvin, for while on the one hand we "exult with the anticipation of life", we at the same time "tremble with the fear of death."² All the meticulous apology and explanation of the Calvinistic past did not suffice to dispel religious fear, so the system of "Evidences" was brought in to give some kind of guarantee regarding faith. But by turning the person to self examination he became more discouraged. Should the individual be satisfied with what he discovers within, he is satisfied with himself which is equally disastrous. Thus the "Evidences" in the effort to escape from one evil, flew to others of which it had not dreamed. Campbell was to establish a new basis for faith and a different interpretation of assurance.

As Campbell points out, it may be very well for us who are in the Christian life to examine ourselves from time to time. "But to ask me to stand in suspense as to my trust in Christ, whether it is a right and saving trust; making this depend on my awareness of fruits of holiness in myself; this is really to suspend faith until I am conscious of the effects of faith." Obviously this is a process which makes faith impossible.

It did not take Campbell long to reach the conclusion that

1. See Institutes, Bk. III Chap. 21; also West (Confession iii, 3;
See Shedd, "Calvinism, Pure & Mixed," p. 21.
2. Institutes, Bk. III Chap. II, sec. 18.

the system of "Evidences" was an artificial standard, of the very essence of legalism, and false to the spirit of Christ. The dread fear which had produced this system, and the discouragement which was the effect of it, could not belong to the life of discipleship. The ~~R~~wo minister was determined to lay this spectre of self-deception as an unwholesome companion of the religious spirit. He pondered and prayed, and the more he "meditated on the secret power of faith to give peace in death or strength for the Christian life," the more he was convinced "that the faith which gave peace at death and in life, the faith which worketh by love and purifieth the heart....., had this power simply by reason of what it was in itself..."¹ Thus it dawned on Campbell that faith ought to carry with it its own assurance that it was a right and proper faith. Without this assurance there was a fetter on the Christian soul. How then could he break the bars that retained his people like so many eagles in a cage, gazing at the heavens which they had not the freedom to possess? This was the problem set before him.

One might suppose that even a blind man could have sensed the unhealthy symptoms which a too technical application of theology had produced. But such a supposition is far from the facts, for there were few men with all their powers who saw that religion had stationed itself on a dead level.

Campbell did see, but he had no vain dreams that the mantle of Calvin or Luther was ordained to fall upon him. He felt responsible for the spiritual welfare of his own parish. The dry

1. Reminiscences and Reflections p. 153.

bones must be made alive and he consecrated himself to discover the quickening spirit which would awaken the religious life of his people. He must discover the secret of his own real faith and study the Scriptures for the spirit which giveth life. He thought that the Scriptures would reveal the elements of the early Christian consciousness, and to them he went back. Not that he had not recognized them in their rightful place, but he had until now never separated them from theology. But now brushing aside theology, pushing his way through the Reformation and on past the early fathers, Campbell made his way back to the Gospel. In the Oxford movement, Newman and Manning leaned on the Church Fathers, but Campbell sought the head waters themselves. With him it was a movement "back to Christ." Unfortunately there were no results of historical criticism to assist him in this task. The Bible was still regarded as all of a piece, but even so, the Christian consciousness which became more and more a part of Campbell, largely triumphed over the unhistorical view of the Scriptures. And though he does not admit that many parts had comparatively little spiritual value, he does tell us that many sections of Scripture took a major place. He was never a bondsman to the textual method, but so entered into the spirit of the Scripture, that when the historical method did come, his faith was undisturbed.

Even in his deep searching of the Scripture, Campbell never regarded it as an external authority absolute in itself. The authority it had was the authority of truth to awaken a response in man. He believed that the Bible gives to us a revelation of God, but one could never really know it as revelation except as

it produced a response in conscience. The truth must commend itself to every man's conscience in the sight of God. This is an important consideration in connection with Campbell. His view of revelation in its relation to the individual helps us to understand how he could reach the conclusions to which he came, as well as the appeal on which he based them.

He believed that the reason of the mind in contact with the revelation given in the Scriptures would together be a safe guide for the religious life of man. Where there was completest agreement, there would be most certainty of truth. We see in Scripture a revelation of God, and if this revelation is genuine it seems necessary to assume that it will strike a responsive note in reason. If this is not so, and revelation is true over against reason, our minds are out of harmony with the universe. Campbell found himself forced to assume a harmony. The harmony is such that revelation is often a supplement to reason, so that reason assents to what of itself it might not have discovered.

"There is a class of minds who take Revelation to the bar of Reason in a way that is a practical denial of its claim to be a Revelation at all; while another class of minds ask for a subordination of Reason to Revelation, nullifying Reason altogether as a voice of God...." "I had undoubting confidence in the teaching of pure reason and also undoubting confidence in the teaching of Revelation; and of those who fail to see here two utterances of one unerring teacher I say that the alternative which seems most to honor faith in Revelation simply makes such faith impossible." "For if Revelation finds nothing in man to which it can appeal, how is it to communicate itself to faith?"

"He who speaking in the name of God depreciates Reason, is taking the ground from under his own feet. He who, under whatever misconception deprives me of Revelation may still leave me Reason, but he who takes Reason from me, in so doing takes away Revelation also."¹

Campbell then, as we shall also have later occasion to see, believed in the internal light of truth. Scripturally stated, it would be, "There is a light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world." This light Campbell took with him to the study of Scripture.

He had a deep regard for the Scriptures. "I received the Bible as from the hand of God, a divine gift suited both to my need as a minister and to my need as a man." There is great reverence here, but that did not hinder him from maintaining that, "external authoritative teaching derived most of its weight from the inward response which it awakened, just as all teaching as to right and wrong did." In these early Row days, the "independent personal conviction had advanced greatly and had much got out of the shell of authority." "If I had been asked, 'What certainty have you that the Father of your Spirit wills that you should glorify Him?', I think I should even then have answered, 'I must believe it, if I believe in Him as the Father of my spirit at all,'" This ground of faith in God as the Father of our spirits, was the "beginning of confidence" which was increasingly felt to be verified as religious experience grew. It was the initial postulate. Christianity is that which must grow out of

1. Rem. and Reflec. page 103.

the fact that God is the Father of our spirits. The content of faith must never be out of harmony with that. The Scriptures cannot speak with authority if anywhere it conflicts with God as Father.

Campbell always felt justified in this attitude toward the Scripture and to truth. He early appealed to his own people on the authority which the weight of truth might have upon them. Many years later he referred to this method, and was glad that this had been the basis on which he made appeal to his people. This was ground for faith which historical criticism would not touch. And furthermore, he felt it to be the only legitimate ground for dealing with people who were in possession of the Bible. Their responsibility for accepting or rejecting its spiritual truth must turn, "not on its history, of which they were incompetent to decide anything of their own proper knowledge, but on its contents and what it teaches man to believe concerning God and the duty which God requires of man."

The fact that the Scriptures were read in this light, makes it possible for us to surmise that a fresh breeze will blow upon us from the shore line of Row.

At this point we may pause for a moment and look back. We have seen the mover of destinies arranging the background for events which shall prove to be great. We have seen a man of keen mind and deep spirit trying to shepherd religious lives tied with theological tether too inadequate for the exercise of the spirit. The situation which is represented by the people of this parish was nothing novel. It had many counterparts in

Britain and America. The situation is almost identical to a hair's breadth with the early New England religious life. The stimulus of the Reformation had spent itself, and men were not using the freedom to go forward which had been given them. Theology had relied too much on what Calvin gave. Many years after his death, theologians were touching the hem of his garment instead of feeling free to move forward with the same liberty which Calvin had displayed for himself.

Campbell seeing all this was touched to the roots with his responsibility. He consecrated himself to find that which would warrant his people in casting off fear and allow them to enter into a heritage of assurance and of hope. To this end he closeted himself with God and with the Word.

As light came to him, there appeared in successive stages the much misunderstood doctrines of Universal Atonement, Universal Pardon, and Assurance as of the Essence of Faith. Their systematic presentation is our task. These were together labelled the "Row Heresy."

Chapter II.

The Row Doctrines.

We are still dealing with the Row stage of Campbell's thinking. This reminder will prevent us from confusing the Atonement at this period with the later development of the Atonement as set forth in the well known book, The Nature of the Atonement. But the universal character of the Atonement clearly seen in the Row days was never abandoned.

The doctrines which we are to consider, dovetail into each other. They depend on each other like the sides of a triangle. The doctrine of Universal Atonement was proclaimed last of the three. The declaration of this doctrine precipitated the opposition which the other two doctrines began, while it also alienated many of those who had been sympathetic to those doctrines.

For our purpose, with the three doctrines before us, it is better to set forth the Universal Atonement first. This is logically prior, and as a matter of fact, when Campbell arrived at it, he placed it first. Then in his instruction and in his preaching, the Universal Atonement was the ground on which rested Universal Pardon and the Assurance of Faith. Although very early Campbell recognized and taught that faith ought to carry with it assurance, the ground on which he later shows why proper faith should do so, is the doctrine of Universal Atonement together with Universal Pardon. Furthermore, the order in which we shall describe the three doctrines is the order preferred by Campbell himself. This arrangement he used when presenting his

defence before the Presbytery, Synod and General Assembly.

Though it is better to give the content of these terms in their logical order, once they are arrived at, we cannot afford to forget that the doctrines were arrived at in the reverse order. The subject of assurance must be thought of as the initial stimulus lying behind Campbell's contribution to theology. The religious situation was the occasion which started a great mind on its way. But we have here to a very large extent an empirical development, in the attempt to discover the right to have a faith which assures.

We saw it dawn upon Campbell that faith ought to carry assurance with it, but that his people were prevented from possessing it, and that his problem was to break the bars that caged them. We know that the people were fettered by fears; fear of self-deception, fear that faith was not a right and saving faith. We can picture Campbell probing the cause and asking, "What lies behind these fears?" Behind them was the inability to feel sure that the love of God was touching the individual personally. This answer may have an alien sound to modern ears so accustomed to hear of God's love to every creature. But hereby hangs a theological tale. Space, however, will make room for but the briefest possible synopsis of that story.

It must be assumed that the reader knows the general outline of the theology of Calvin. We can merely give a paragraph to provide for the continuity in the steps which Campbell was taking toward a fresher interpretation of faith and the Atonement.

The individual, it has been observed, could not be sure that the love of God was embracing him personally. The practical

effect of Calvinism was to produce a feeling that the love of God had actually a very restricted application. God might love the world, but it came to mean practically, a very restricted area in which that love was effective. The Atonement, despite all the scholastic argument to prove it in harmony with the general offer of salvation, was efficacious only for the elect. God's love to men in the Atonement was confined to the elect. The reason for God's choice to elect some from among men is a mystery hid in the secret counsels of God.¹ But the sin of the elect must be punished, and Christ bears this punishment. We have thus a decidedly legal transaction, whether we view the sufferings as exactly the amount which the elect would have suffered,² or as a rectoral and public punishment as held by the modified Calvinists.³ So the love of God, in the mind of the listener to the theological discourse, is understood to be effective only for that limited number whom God has from the foundation of the world predestined unto life.⁴ Thus it came about that Campbell's parishioners, with a goodly number throughout the world, could

1. Institutes Bk. III Chap. 21 - From Calvin to Kuyper and Hastie this is the final refuge from the inexplicable nature of Election. They say with Calvin: "Let us not be ashamed to be ignorant in a matter in which ignorance is learning."

2. Institutes Bk. II Chap. 12, sec. 1; chap. 16, sec. 8.

3. The system of modified Calvinism has been analyzed in Campbell's "Nature of the Atonement." He shows here that the sterner view of Edwards is really preferable to the modifications of Calvinism which make the Christian pilgrimage even more tortuous than Calvin's prescribed path. It is noteworthy that modified Calvinism held a universal atonement.

4. This general scheme has been adhered to by Calvinists down to recent years - Hodge; Strong; Hastie "Theol. of the Ref. Church"; Kuyper "Lectures on the Stone Foundation - Princeton" etc.

not feel that the love of God embraced them personally. The sufferings of Christ might be for them, but perhaps not. One could not be sure.

Over against these restrictions on the extent of God's love, Campbell found the Scriptures proclaiming God's love to all men. He observed a universal sweep to the activities of God, embracing mankind as a whole. And this was the kind of God which the Christian consciousness both revealed and demanded. If Christ was the expression of that universal love of God to men, then the work which Christ did must be as universal as the love of God, and bearing some relation to everyone of the sons of men.

In spite of some passages of Scripture currently regarded as in line with a limitation of the Atonement, Campbell saw there no denial that Christ died for all. In fact, he found a great deal specifically indicating its extent as universal.¹ Paul tells the Corinthians (1 Cor. 15:1,3) that in declaring the Gospel to them, he preached "first of all", "that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures." Paul is not speaking of a message to an esoteric few, but stating that his first message to them, who were in an unChristian condition, was the announcement that Christ died for their sins, even though they had not yet accepted or fully understood these glad tidings. This surely is God's love in Christ manifested for the sake of all men, even as it hath been declared: "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us and sent His Son to be a propitiation

1. 1 Jno 2:2; Isa 53 ... iniquity of us all.; John 3:16; Romans 5:18..... free gift came upon all"; Luke 2:10; John 6:32-33,51; John 4:42; etc.

for our sins". (1 John 4:10.)

If we do not accept this universal intention behind the Atonement, then, "we have no longer the Creator revealed in the Redeemer; and we can no longer say to every man that he is to look to the sufferings of Calvary, if he would know the heart of God in whom he lives and moves and has his being." For we are given to understand that the kind of love which God has shown toward us in Christ, is the same kind of love that God expects us to show toward our fellows. We see this if we take the preceding quotation of Scripture in its completeness. "Herein is love....., therefore, Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another." There is no more reason for limiting the demand on us to love all men as our brothers, than there is for us to suppose God's love restricted toward us. Rather, the demand on us to love one another, finds its sanction in the universality of the love of God.

We find ourselves carried along by Campbell, who so clearly discerns the religious basis of Christianity. We find him jealous of the honor due unto God. His moral sense will not be violated. He feels truth itself speaking to him as in Timothy¹ there arises the exhortation to pray for all men, which "is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth; for there is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus who gave Himself a ransom for all to be testified in due time." Therefore, adds Campbell, "the call to pray

1. 1 Timothy 2:1-6.

for all, rests on the willingness of God to save all as manifested by the death of Christ for all."¹

Campbell pleads with men to step away from the unwarranted fencing in of the terms, "all" and "for the whole world." We should get the spirit of these words. These, "expressions should be received just according to what would be their natural bearing upon the mind, reading without preconception the passages in which they occur..."² He understood the spirit of the gospels, particularly the Fourth. He did not know the critical results as they effect the Fourth Gospel, but the same Spirit which spoke through the pen of the author, spoke again to the minister at Row. There are many appeals to John's Gospel with its universal sweep. Here he finds Christ praying, "that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me." "Does the world then mean election?" "If the use of any word be more fixed than another, it is this word (world); and once admit that it means all mankind, and this will decide the question as to whether Christ did or did not die for all men."³

It is evident that Campbell had already set his foot on the road which leads to the heart of God. "The mind of Christ is that from which we are to learn the mind of God." To deny the love of Christ as a love to all men, seemed the very denial of the character of that life. "Take away the love to all men manifested in what he did, and then you take away the explanation

1.Speech before Presbytery of Dumbartonshire, Whole Proceedings, First Part, p.26.

2.General Assembly Speech,p.52 "General Assembly Prodeedings."

3.The reference to election from his Assembly Speech shows us that Campbell is getting away from election. The year before in the Dumbarton Presbytery he was inclined to think some form of election might be held.

of his being exalted." Because of his love "every knee shall bow and every tongue confess." His love goes to the extent of the Cross and is a tasting of death for every man. But, "this is not a mere purchasing of human beings by an arbitrary price, but a purchasing men by love; and God saw it altogether consistent with His own glory, and altogether worthy of Himself, that in the person of the Son He should be seen, and in the person of the Son He should be acknowledged, and that all should bow to the Son because of the character that was manifested in his work for man."¹

"If my actions are to testify that I delight in God, that I rejoice and find happiness in what He is, then of course I must know Him; and it is a very great and awful error, in which people are, who look on the work of Christ as merely a ground of confidence before God, standing on which, they are to rest and believe all is well, instead of looking at the work of Christ as the great revelation of God. The way in which such people think and speak, is just the very opposite of what Christ teaches. They see the work of Christ as a sort of substitute for the knowledge of God - and not a revelation of God; as a something to make up for the want of likeness to God; as a something that gives them security, when they have no conformity to His will. The very opposite of this is its true character. To reverence God, you need not something that will be to you a security, but you need something that will make God visible to you, so that you can rejoice in God. Now the work of Christ has done so.....so that there is now a discovery of God in the work of Christ..."²

To all men Christ brings His message. The responsibility rests on all men to respond. They are to bow before Him, not in mere acknowledgement of power, nor in mere acknowledgement of might, but it is to be the "homage of the affections," "the bowing of the heart."

1.Speech before Synod of Ayr and Glasgow, "Whole Proceedings", second part, p.184.

2.Sermon preached in Floating Chapel, Greenock 1830, p.19.

It is not yet made clear to us just what the nature of the revelation and of the atonement is. We shall presently discuss that, but we note Campbell's chief concern here; his great and central purpose, was to convince men first, that there was a love in God to every human being, theological dogma to the contrary notwithstanding. This to him was an initial truth, and he was willing to take its consequences, lead where it would. He felt secure that a satisfactory understanding of the Atonement would flow from the basic certainty of God's love to all. He wanted to rid men's minds of ideas which limited the love of God.

The consistent application of current theology was actually making men hold "that there is no love at all in God to any but the elect, and that there is no feeling of interest in their wellbeing, expressed by God's care of the rest of the children of men." "According to this view of God's character, we are not warranted to say to any that God bears them any good-will, unless we know that they are elected persons: and while this rests ultimately on the untrue and awful principle, that all events, good and bad, are alike the fulfilling of the will of God, it is at the same time repugnant to those apprehensions of God which are written in the natural conscience...." It takes away "the foundation of a righteous judgment"; it connects "men's misconduct with the will of God; it cherishes the feeling that sin is something which men cannot help, and so is something which it would be unrighteous in God to punish."¹

Against this he held that if the work of Christ, including

1. Whole Proceedings, second part, page 195.

the Atonement, meant anything, it certainly meant first of all the unveiling of God's love to all men. The invitation freely given to all men to return back again to God from whom they had gone astray, directs men to "look at God in Jesus Christ." "The secret of God's character is revealed in the work of redemption." "Christ came, not to change his Father, but to declare his Father's name; and when we see the work of God in Christ, and the love of God in Christ, we are not seeing some love in God, some mercy and tenderness which had come forth in consequence of the work of Christ, but we are seeing a work springing from what was in the heart of our Creator who has become our Redeemer."¹ God is our Redeemer in the sense that it is his redeeming love which sent Christ into the world declaring the love of the Father, who desires that all men shall come unto a knowledge of the truth. The word Universal cannot be removed, for it conveys the universal intention and desire behind the Atonement. If Christ came to reveal the Father, then all that He did must be seen as a part of it. To view this revelation with its intention to save men, as purposely limited, as not intended for mankind as a whole, is to Campbell a travesty of the character of God. It is for all; whosoever will, let him come.

Having reached such doctrine, Campbell could confidently approach his people with the sanction for a belief that God's love did embrace them individually. It had a relation to each one personally. Now they could say, "Here is an evidence of the love of God with an intention to encompass me." This was

¹.Whole Proceedings, second part, page 185.

new doctrine, and like new ideas, it created attention.¹

The Nature of the Atonement at this Period.

It is abundantly apparent that the work of Christ is regarded as a manifestation of the love of God to every creature. Campbell presents a forcible case on that side. It would not be a great tribute to his thinking, however, if the Atonement in character remained the same as that of the traditional theology. It does not remain the same, so the recurring phrase, "died for all", needs explanation.

At times one would almost think that Campbell had so removed himself from his environment, as to regard the whole work of Christ in terms of manifestation only, without viewing the sufferings of Christ as in any way a propitiation for sin. In this case, the effect of the work would be its influence on the sinner. Much of the foregoing could suggest that, and the following is another illustration:

"It is this discovery of the character of God that he so loved me while I was at enmity against Him that works love in me to Him, and puts me in a condition to share in His condemnation of sin, and makes me hate the evil thing in me that He hates".... "and so in looking at His character in the face of

1. Many years later Campbell wrote, "The great extent to which theoretic Calvinism had in those days possession of the minds of all who were much occupied with religion, made my preaching 'news' as well as good; and there was a positive advantage in there being something to get over, as compared with the present time in which the assertion that 'Christ died for all' is so far from awaking surprise, that the opposite would more surprise." Memorials, vol. II, 246.

Jesus Christ, I with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord am changed into the same image from glory to glory even as by the Spirit of the Lord."¹ If this is not the principle by which sinners are to be saved, how else can they be regenerated? he asks. That is, the advancement of the Kingdom of God must depend on the triumph of right over wrong, of truth over falsehood, of the intrinsic excellence of good over evil. If the revelation of God's character cannot compel our turning to God, what can? If the revelation of God's love does not impel us to desire communion with Him, then what could make us love God?

This phase of the Atonement is strongly present in Campbell, as the further exposition of his doctrines makes clear. It is from this that his great theory of the atonement grew. But in the Row period the Atonement does not stop there. There is right along in his thinking always a great deal more than that. At this period he vascillates' a good deal. There are various aspects of the Atonement on which he temporarily rests.

It is in these other aspects of the Atonement that we come to appreciate how circumscribed was this thinking by the conditions of the time. The development of the Atonement up to this point, represents its unbridled stage. What we have seen so far is new discovery, the results of exploration. We have been impressed by the freedom and breadth of vision. But now, like a ship coming in from sea, Campbell has to navigate in a very narrow channel. He is shut in by the limitations of know-

1. Sermon, "Peace in the Knowledge of God"- pamphlet printed 1830.

:ledge. Biblical criticism had cut no barriers, and the theory of evolution was unborn. He is under compulsion to think in terms of Adam and the first sin; a world six thousand years old; the covenant of works; man's depravity and Pauline conceptions, with the exegesis of his period. These forms of thought do not trouble us, but in 1830 they would have been the furniture of our minds as well.

We are compelled to see many of Campbell's ideas tied down with ropes of the past. We must orient ourselves and stand beside him. At first as the idea of God's love in Christ unfolds, he goes forward with it in the freedom of those unformed years that lie ahead. While thus projected, as it were, he gives to us the passages so rich in spiritual content, so free from traditional symbols. To this extent, he is a man ahead of his time. But the roots of the man are, of course, where they are. It is only later on that he is transplanted, but now he is rooted in the past. Its soil and atmosphere ^aeffect him.

The Atonement as a revelation of the love and character of God is gathered from the Gospels. But its explanation, particularly the sufferings of Christ, are found in the letters of Paul. It is from this source that Campbell's ideas are shaped. What he understands Paul to say has peculiar weight, for did not Paul himself declare that it was by revelation that the mystery of the dispensation of Grace came to him?¹

Man sinned against God and was, therefore, a rebel at enmity with God. Mankind broke the law, and thereby came under the

¹.Ephesians, 3:3.

condemnation or curse of the law. God hates sin and must punish sin, yet he is full of love to the sinner. God desires a reconciliation; He desires that man shall worship Him as a Father. God desires to place man under a new dispensation of Grace that had been promised, and to reveal Himself as a Father. In order to do this, the law must be fulfilled. It had been broken; it must be satisfied. Only by its being satisfied could it be honorably set aside and closed forever. If that could be done, man could be removed from under the judgment of the law. The broken law or man's sins was the barrier which prevented him from enjoying God. Christ is to accomplish all this, and we naturally ask just how Campbell conceives this to be done.

It is not possible to place our finger on any one idea and say, "Eureka!" A careful examination of his early sermons reveals a state of mind that is struggling with the explanation. There are different angles in his thinking. It is in these sermons that we get our clues, as the Trial material reveals nothing other than the ideas already considered. This may be taken as an indication that Campbell had reached no solution as to the nature of the Atonement at that time, which satisfied him. But none of his conceptions on the Atonement in this period are at one with the Atonement embodied in the Westminster Confession, nor are any of these ideas well thought out.

One phase of Campbell's mental debate reveals the Atonement as God incarnate in human nature. He took our nature that he might in our nature bear the punishment due from a broken law. In this way he fulfilled the requirements of the law, satisfied it and thereby exhausted it, put it away as a closed book. In

consequence, man is no longer under the law, but under Grace. Christ, "having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments..... that he might reconcile both unto God in one body on the Cross, having slain the enmity thereby" Eph. 2:15-17. Having done this he, "came and preached peace to you which are afar off and to them that are nigh." "Through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father." Though there is the element of punishment in this idea; it is not the punishment for the sin of an elect group. It is punishment which satisfied the old law, not in order to make the individual safe for heaven, but simply to bring in the new era of Grace. Judgment in this era will not be the law, but will depend on the acceptance or rejection of the Gospel. There are a number of criticisms which readily arise, but the scenes are being changed so rapidly that it is useless to criticize.

Another aspect of the Atonement reveals Christ as condemning sin in the flesh. He ~~condemns~~ sin in several ways. In being so opposite in nature from sin, he condemns it. His overcoming of all its seductions shows to us that sin is evil. But by sacrificing Himself, Christ manifested what sin merited. Sin merited punishment and death. Christ is in full accord with God's feeling regarding sin, so Christ submits Himself to be the sacrifice which will atone for it. If he did not concur^{with} in God's judgment against sin, he would not have offered Himself in behalf of man.

Then again, in trying to define the significance of flesh and blood, he regards them as the material body necessary to make visible the invisible qualities of God. It is said that eternal life is in Christ. "Now what is there in the flesh and

blood of Christ to accord with the language that there is this eternal life in them?" Most of Campbell's answer to this question which he puts to himself, enforces the idea that the Atonement is wholly revelation of God's character. "The flesh and the blood have eternal life in them, on this principle, that the life became light, and that what in God was God's own blessedness has become visible in the broken body and shed blood of Jesus, and that in this shape it can become life to me."

"Observe, there is life in this broken body and shed blood of Jesus, because that holiness, love, righteousness, truth, goodness and mercy, which were in the being of God from all eternity, are now contained in this body and blood in manifestation: so that any person who understands the body and blood of Christ, is in the knowledge of God's holiness, righteousness, truth, goodness, mercy and love."¹ But in this same sermon, the suffering of Christ is regarded as setting aside the old law by ^{Christ} taking upon himself that which the unjust had not fulfilled.

A little later, however, we have a different view in which the explanation of Christ condemning sin in the flesh is not at all coupled with the idea of taking upon himself the punishment due to a broken law. There was a certain repugnance attached to the idea of Christ actually suffering the penalty of our sin. Campbell in this attempt finds another way to explain the condemnation, while at the same time Christ is enabled to fulfil the law. The law was weak through the flesh or because of the flesh. "For what the law could not do in that it was weak

1. Sermon preached in Old Church, Dundee, Jan. 10, 1830 - Pamphlet.

through the flesh, God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit." Romans 8:3-4. The defect was not in the law, but in the flesh. Christ was sent in the likeness of sinful flesh; in fact he really "was a man." Christ took our human nature "just as we have it"; "he took that very flesh which made the law weak."

In view of this condition, how was Christ able to condemn sin and fulfil the law? The flesh "had been weak in the case of every other, was it then weak in Christ's case?" No, he kept himself without spot, fulfilled the law, "loving the Lord His God with His whole heart and soul and mind and strength, and His neighbour as Himself." Instead of yielding to the flesh, he conquered it, conquered sin in the flesh. He condemned sin by putting it under his heel, and he thus manifested how God also regards sin. Christ "completed this testimony in giving himself to die." How does this effect mankind? By Christ the law was at last fulfilled in the flesh. "Christ proved that in flesh and blood he could glorify the Father and having thus glorified the Father he received power over all flesh. Christ now has the Spirit, which he gives to man. Man is removed from the law and is under Grace. The sinner in turning to Christ received the Spirit, the same Spirit which enabled Christ to present himself without spot before God. Man is thus born from above.¹

1. Sermon on Romans 8:1-4 vol. I of Shorthand Notes, Sermon 14 - 1831.

These theological flights of Campbell are interesting to the extent that we can see this germ of fatherly love threading its way through the body of ideas, which was the material of men's thinking. This brief glance at Campbell's mental panorama has sufficiently convinced us that he is not at all settled on the nature of the Atonement. He entertains one idea after another, but is never satisfied with them. However, we do know that by the time of the Trial, Campbell had rid himself of the idea that the suffering of Christ was a legal punishment. The preceding paragraph indicates it, and a letter written to his brother in India January 1, 1831 is quite specific on the matter. "...instead of resting in the character of God as revealed in Christ, they looked upon the death of Christ as so much suffering - the purchase money of heaven to a certain number, to whom it infallibly secured heaven."¹

We can say for this period, that Campbell is convinced that the Atonement is to be interpreted by love and that it reveals the character of God. "We have just to see what is the character of God." But we are left with no detailed definition as to the elements of the Atonement. He simply arrives at a point where he sees a manifestation of love in the work of Christ. He goes at least far enough beyond this to see that this basis of love takes the Atonement out of the range of the legal fiction surrounding it at the time. This is a very significant change, but before he can follow it out

¹. This letter quoted in full Rem. & Reflec. p. 9 ff, above quotation found on page 25.

in all its implications, the Trial is upon him. As a result, he has to defend a doctrine only half complete. This gave warrant to the impression that the doctrine of Universal Atonement was merely an extension of the kind of Atonement which the opposition professed. This however, is not the case. It does not accord with the situation as we have been able to uncover it.

Doctrine of Universal Pardon.

This is the second of the three doctrines to be discussed. It carries a connotation to many minds which immediately awakens the debating instinct. However, it has a different content from what on the face of it is implied. The word "Pardon" was a most unfortunate choice of terminology, for it was responsible for a considerable degree of misunderstanding and misrepresentation. Campbell admitted that it was difficult to expound this teaching without misunderstanding. But this was due, not to the content, but to the term itself which obscured the content.

The Atonement had as its object, the return of man to God. In this atoning work of Christ, "God came forth to man, testifying to him the forgiveness of his sins as a thing already given to him; as a thing that he is now invited to realize as true, and in the realizing of which as true, he is to be emboldened to come to God." Pardon will be best understood if it is kept in mind as forgiveness. God has forgiven man and is now waiting for men to return to Him.

This forgiveness is related to the death of Christ. Christ is, as was pointed out under the previous discussion, a witness for the Father. But He is more than that. There is an atoning efficacy of some kind along with the witnessing to the Father, which is the ground of God's forgiveness.

The forgiveness Campbell has in mind is not an "act of indemnity" in which the sin of all men is cancelled by Christ suffering the penalty on the Cross for them. The Atonement

does not mean that, neither does pardon. That would be practically a teaching of Universal Salvation, and with this Campbell has nothing to do. If the Atonement to Campbell meant punishment for sin in the sense that the Westminster Confession holds it, then his extension of the Atonement would imply a pardon to all, as effective for all as that given to the elect. But because the Atonement has not that meaning, neither does pardon imply a general amnesty. However, owing to the customary thought on these subjects, Campbell was by the great majority, completely misunderstood. The general public was given to understand by opponents of Campbell that a scheme was being advocated which included the salvation of all, indiscriminately.

Such crass ideas are on a plane far away from the realm in which Campbell moved. He does not at all suggest that men are no longer responsible for their sin. He does mean that God has toward us the love of a Father, who is not holding up our sin as an obstacle to our reconciliation with Him. We are dealing here, not with punishment, but with love. The nature of the moral universe is such that we shall pay dearly for our sin, but God does not make that sin a stumbling block between the sinner and Himself. The Prodigal Son has been away sinning, but when he returns he does not find a moat between himself and his father's house. Quite the contrary, the burning heart of the father has been yearning at the foot of the path every day in search of his son, that he may catch a glimpse of him afar off and welcome him. This is like God. "This is our God. This is our Father, the Father of our spirits. This is our God

coming to meet us."¹

Universal Pardon is really that constant attitude of forgiveness in God which Christ revealed. Universal forgiveness in its reference to the sinner, shows us that God "declares his having sinned to be no longer any barrier to his returning to the enjoyment of the light of God's love; yea, giving the assurance that it is not only a righteous thing in God to receive back into favour, not taking into account the sin justly chargeable against him; but even, so to speak, to help him back, and by his own Spirit to lift him up into the light of His own love, and enjoyment of His own holiness."² "God has forgiven sinners their departing from him, and so he invites them to return." "Believe that your sins are forgiven, because they are forgiven."

In one sense this is an unconditional forgiveness. It is given to man; all that he has to do is to accept it. It is not dependent on belief, but is already an accomplished fact. However, in Campbell's earliest thinking on this subject forgiveness was dependent on belief. In a letter³ to Robert Story, exception is taken to Story's ideas. "Now, do you believe that the sins of men are forgiven before they believe - and this is a fact concerning every man whom you address, although he should never believe? If so, so far as I yet see, I could not go along with you." Story modified his view to accord with Campbell's criticism. Later, however, Campbell took the very form of words for using which, he had criticized Story. It was then Story's

1. Sermons Vol. 2, p. 410, Sermon on Prodigal Son-Excellent, strikingly modern.

2. Whole Proceedings, 1st part, page 35.

3. Memoir of Robert Story, page 114.

turn to change the mind of his friend, but he was unable.

Campbell saw a real truth here, but he did not sufficiently distinguish between the forgiveness that is with God, and that forgiveness which is a particular fact accomplished. Campbell could not get quite the right turn to his language. He did see that there was forgiveness with God antecedent to all that man could do by way of response, and that it was the knowledge of this love which should move men to confidently trust God. That is what he meant, but he failed to distinguish adequately between that attitude of forgiveness, and that condition or awareness of having been forgiven which is an accomplished fact after the repentant has turned to God. Campbell differed from Story just because he wanted to make unmistakeably clear that the forgiveness which God holds out to us is not caused by our repentance, but that in turning to God we take advantage of it. However, confusion was introduced by the inability to make the matter altogether clear. The people thought Campbell meant that every human being was completely and unconditionally pardoned of all sin. He did not mean this of course, but he often expressed himself strangely enough to give much warrant for the impression.

Campbell desires to find Scripture warrant for his ideas. He does find such ground, but his interest is not to find some proof text. He is aware that many distinctions of thought, "are rather implied than expressed in the record of truth." It is, therefore, by a study of such subjects as the character of God, the nature of repentance and the nature of righteousness that we arrive at conceptions, which though not definitely stated,

are nevertheless in accord with truth. So impressed was Campbell with the obligation to welcome new truth, whether from Christian experience or in the sanctuary of the soul, that in one of his trial speeches he declared: "It is not a question as to the meaning of this or that passage of the Word, but the great question of what God would have us to believe concerning Himself." "And if this doctrine is true, then must it be found, not in one passage only, but must pervade the whole revelation which God has given of Himself." This whole revelation had a wide embrace. It was not confined to the Scripture, but to the whisperings of the voice of God in life and in nature.

He finds sanction for Pardon, not only in the Parable of the Prodigal Son, but in Hebrews the tenth chapter. This chapter was one which assisted him in the expression of his ideas on Pardon.¹ As we might expect, the epistle is regarded as from the hand of Paul.

The "apostle" is urging the brethren to have "boldness to enter into the holy place by the blood of Christ", and to do so with confidence just because there has been opened to them a "new and living way". According to his exegesis of this chapter, there is a pardon held out to all. It is on the basis of this pardon that the "Apostle" makes his exhortation, which is expected to enable us to do just the opposite of what men claim will be the result of preaching universal pardon. "Men say it will cause indifference; the Apostle values it entirely as an

1. He not only used Hebrews 10 in the Trial, but as early as two years before the Trial, in a letter to his father, gave his reactions to this passage. Memorials vol. I, page 65.

access to the enjoyment of communion with God." "They say, 'If we are all pardoned, we need not heed what we do.' The Apostle says, 'Seeing we are pardoned, we have access into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, and let us avail ourselves of it and draw near.'" "And from the very fact of having been pardoned, he argues the awful state of those who will not come to God, who has had mercy upon them, and rejoice in His love."¹

Relation of Universal Pardon to Repentance.

Campbell's doctrine of Universal Pardon or forgiveness stands out clearly when seen in connection with Repentance.

There was some confusion between the view of Campbell and that of Arminianism. So he says, it is difficult for some to conceive this doctrine as "any thing else than the Arminian doctrine of God's readiness to forgive and pardon all, on condition of their repenting and believing."

"In truth, however, no two doctrines can be more widely different. After a man is supposed to have repented and believed, on that system, he is only then in that condition of right to come to God with confidence, in which, according to the true doctrine of the Scriptures, he was placed by the sacrifice of Christ...; and as long as repenting and believing occupy in men's minds this place of preliminary requisites, in order to having a title to approach God with boldness, of confidence in his fatherly love to us, and free acceptance of us; it makes little difference whether we professedly hold the system known by the name of Arminianism, or attempt to separate between ourselves and it by limiting the atonement, and by holding strictly that the faith and the repentance are the gifts of God."²

1. Memorials, Vol. I, p. 65.

2. Whole Proceedings, First Part, p. 36.

The view of pardon here propounded, seeks to make clear the free and unconditional character of forgiveness. Forgiveness in God is frequently thought of as that which takes place when repentance occurs. But Campbell, in order to show his difference from that position, explains the relation of repentance to this pardon; also in what respect he conceives the believer and unbeliever to be the same, and in what respect in different situations in regard to this pardon.

It is held that repentance is essential, but the objection is likely to arise that if all are forgiven, what need is there for repentance. Campbell disposes of this objection with a penetrating reply. It is a reply which shows us that the interest of its author is to free repentance from selfish purpose, and to ground it in the attractiveness of good for its own sake.

"If men's sins are forgiven, what occasion have they to repent? But there is an awful ignorance of what repentance is, implied in this question, and an awful recklessness of the difference between good and evil; inasmuch as a person so speaking would teach that he has no motive to be sorry for his sins; and that he has no cause to regret having offended his heavenly Father; that he has no inducement to repent of his having been polluted and debased, excepting the hope that he may be pardoned - that take away the desire of pardon and you take away the only motive to repentance. But what is repentance? Is it not the heart turning to God and putting trust in God and glorifying God as God?.... Can any man rejoice in God as God who does not see in that God his own friend, his own Redeemer, his own forgiving and loving Father."

This is further explained by the following illustration. A son has deeply offended his father and is away from the father's house because he desires to escape the judgment of his father. He is in fact banished from his father by his sin.

"Suppose, I said to him, 'Your father has not yet forgiven you, but if you repent, if you begin to love him, then he will forgive you.' Do you think he could really repent then?" "He could not in the smallest degree. He might do a great many things.... but as for loving him, the very thought of his father's wrath would prevent it. Everything he did to win his father's favour, could proceed from nothing but the selfish wish to get his forgiveness and favour." "But repentance is not a selfish thing. There is no holiness in my anxiety to get to heaven for my own happiness; no holiness in my desire to escape from hell, just as an escape from misery." It is not maintained that such an interest in safety is sinful, but in any case it is not true holiness. Our repentance should be a turning toward God who has shown His love to us in Christ, with an attitude free from any possible selfishness. It should be a desire to enjoy God and to serve Him with a service motivated by love.

The aim is to find ground on which the sinner may come to God, nevertheless his so turning to God, which is repentance, does not confer the right of his approach. It is not by reason of the repentance that God forgives, but in the forgiveness of God the sinner has a knowledge of the love and character of God. The attraction of this love and holiness is the drawing power. Motive is purged of self interest, and repentance is a turning to God with a burden of sorrow for the dishonor which has been cast upon God in the state of sin.

The believer and unbeliever are in the same situation in so far as their right to approach God with confidence is concerned. The believer, however, is a person who has repented.

This has not conferred the right to approach God, it is but, "taking advantage of the right" - "my title to return to God is not in fact that I do return, but my returning is my availing myself of a title to return antecedently conferred by God in the exercise of his free love." The believer differs from the unbeliever in that "he accepts as true God's testimony on the subject of that right," to return. "My believing creates nothing by believing, I only receive what God has already given, light into my understanding and love into my heart - God Himself to dwell in me by His Spirit, who is the Spirit of Christ, who is Truth."¹

There is, however, "an awful and solemn difference between believers and unbelievers as to pardon." Believers "are drinking of the fountain of life of which pardon is the opening; while unbelievers are receiving no light whatever from it." This is bad enough because of its unfortunate results for this life. But there is also a difference with respect to their prospects for the future. Those who have accepted God's testimony have the means which leads them back to God; whereas the unbeliever is not in the way of salvation, but subject to God's judgment in the last day. His portion is a "second death." This penalty is really a going to one's own place. In the case of the believer, he has by accepting God's testimony; accepting the condition of forgiveness and pardon held out to him, entered into a life of sonship. He receives eternal life, which is a quality of life beginning now. The unbeliever is outside of this eternal life, has never entered into it, and continues

1. Whole Proceedings, First Part, p. 37.

outside of it and is dead both to this and to eternal life.

Effects of Universal Forgiveness.

This doctrine of Universal Pardon is more than a mere good will on the part of God towards the sinner. Its author thinks that this is not enough. He is keeping in mind the needs of his people, who are short on assurance. Now he feels that their thankfulness and appreciation of what God has done for them, with the consequent spur to good motives, will be heightened greatly by the fact of the forgiveness held out to them. Heightened, because as sinners they will feel how little they deserved such love ~~which~~ the Father has bestowed upon them. Then when they understand that sin has not blotted them out of the heart of God, "has not dried up to them the fountain of God's love," but that at the very time when their evil condition has been in itself abhorrent, even "at that time His love was that very love which is expressed by the sufferings of Jesus." And in coming to a knowledge of what has thus been done for them, their thankfulness and appreciation is so great as to be a tremendous motive in spurring them on to live a life of love.

The servant parable illustrates this principle, while serving at the same time to indicate that forgiveness as here considered does not set aside God's judgment of men. The servant parable in Matthew 18 follows as the explanation to Peter of the forgiveness which is seventy times seven. Having recited this story of the servant who was forgiven so much, and who

forgives not even a little in return, Campbell gives this interesting comment:

"This parable was intended to teach Peter forgiveness and on this ground, that the reason why God forgives men, is to make men love one another. When men are not by God's forgiveness made loving and forgiving, then God inflicts punishment upon them. Forgiveness is conferred for the purpose of teaching forgiveness, and where that object is not effected, judgment follows. Connect this with the petition, 'forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors', and still more with Our Lord's commentary upon it, for 'if you forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your heavenly Father forgive your trespasses.' Connect this also with the words, 'blessed are the merciful for they shall obtain mercy', and then you will have the links of the chain."¹

This element of motive is a significant element arising from this doctrine. This point of view after all is said and done, is an attempt to explain the nature of love, and the course which love will take toward the sinner. It is love which is to cast out fear, and love which will propagate itself in the believer by its own power; its own intrinsic beauty and excellence.

The meaning of this universal forgiveness is now before us. Setting aside for the moment the symbol by which this doctrine is designated, we can see that we have here an effort to express a great evangelical truth. In essence it is the simple gospel unadorned with theological setting. It is simply the declaration which is made today to every sinful man, e.g. your sins, bad as they are, have not turned away the face of your Father. These sins have not been set up as a barrier between you and God. Do we not then picture to the man the

¹. Sermon preached in Gaelic Chapel, Paisley, 1830 or 1831.

father in the parable; his yearning spirit for the son desecrating himself amidst vice. And we say, "That is like God." We paint the love of Christ toward the outcast and brokenhearted; we see him with ceaseless effort telling men about the Father and the life of sonship; and we see his spirit suffer when men's hearts are hard in the face of the revelation of love. And we say, "God is like that too." And we say all this because we believe that love alone will beget its due response; that it is the consuming fire which can melt the hardness in men's souls and awaken within them sorrow and repentance. This in short is the very heart of Campbell's doctrine, called by the confusing name, Universal Pardon.

Later on Campbell saw clearly enough not only the ambiguity of the term, but its complete unsuitableness to convey the right idea. That is the reason we hear nothing of Universal Pardon in his great work on the atonement. The symbol drops out of sight altogether, and instead, we have a magnificent conception of what atonement and salvation really are.

Assurance as the Essence of Faith.

We have already laid stress on assurance as the initiating stimulus to Campbell's thinking. Its vacant place in the religious life at Row was the pit into which the hopes of the people had fallen. So assurance became the creative spirit which formed, out of the love of God, kindred ideas to attend it.

Assurance embodied itself into a definite doctrinal form

which has rich spiritual content. Its doctrinal expression is unique and important. It is a theological contribution of merit. It was original with Campbell, but its similarity to Luther's, "Justification by Faith" is striking, and calls for serious comparison.

We are keeping in mind the practical problem out of which this whole discussion has arisen, and to which each doctrine in turn applies. The doctrine we are now about to discuss, is the apex of the evangelical phalanx which scattered doubt and fear to the four winds. Supported from behind by Universal Atonement and Pardon; Assurance of Faith actually did transform the religious outlook of those who came in contact with its power.

The two doctrines of the Atonement and Pardon as Campbell sees them, throw new light on man's appreciation of the character of God. This had been insufficiently kept before men's minds. The ways of God in dealing with mankind are revelations of the kind of God we have. The God who is shown to us in an unlimited Atonement, and in a pardon extending to the farthest fringe of the human mass, is more than a God of power. God is Almighty, but he is also majestic in love. The two phases have too frequently been separated. Power separated from love is in itself incapable of calling forth our praise. "If we would praise power, it is because of the character according to which that power acts." So long as we see God as a power only, God's character is unknown. But in contact with His love, we understand his character.

Herein we see a root difference between Campbell and Cal-

vinism. It is true Campbell did not yet know what a fundamental change he had wrought. But to interpret the sovereignty of God by love is to lay ground for a new theology. The Geneva method in the development of sovereignty, gave to us Calvinism as we see it solidified in the Westminster Confession. When, however, the entire approach is to interpret God by love, we get the gospel of Jesus.

A consciousness of God's character then, is the consequent result which grows out of the doctrines of Atonement and Pardon. A new attitude of mind is growing up in the congregation at Row. There is the fresh interest of discovery.¹ The great power who moved the stars, was no longer a God afar off. The sovereign Spirit whose secret reasons for Election were hid in some distant sun, now became a God near at hand. God's character obscured by filmy clouds, now came forth as the beneficent spirit of fatherhood. And this all goes deeper than mere figure of speech. It was a real experience. It is difficult for us to understand how much of reality there is behind this attempt to describe the freshness of a new day that had dawned for the Christian life. The Christian spirit was coming into its own. Standing on the new ground of God's character as revealed in the Atonement and Pardon, it had obtained the Assurance which is of the essence of faith.

God has given to man a testimony concerning Himself. He has given many revelations of Himself in nature and the world at large, but the testimony concerning the love and character of God have come to us through Christ. We find the life and character of Christ awakening a response in us that he is indeed the

1. Memorials, vol. II, p. 246.

light of truth; that his witness of the Father is a true witness. He that hath seen Christ, hath seen the Father. This very early was at the core of Campbell's faith. The truth which this statement contains, he says in a letter to his father two years before the Trial, is, "the anchor of my soul" - "that in knowing the mind and feelings of Christ I know the mind and feelings of God."¹

The person, whoever he may be, whose religious faith rests in that kind of God;-the God and Father of Jesus, is, by very nature of that faith, enjoying an assurance of God's love toward him personally. So that by seeing the kind of God we have, our religious consciousness is purged of all unworthy notions of Him, and we see ourselves in a more natural, wholesome and filial relation to God. We now cannot doubt of His love toward us. We are assured of it as an accompaniment of our belief in Him as a Father. There springs up into the religious life an assured confidence in God, a trust in Him for all that is essential to the religious spirit within us. "It requires no demonstration." It belongs to religious consciousness. "A man who is living his natural life does not require to be told that he is alive..... If so of the natural life, how much more of the spiritual life. When I am beholding and enjoying God....this is salvation; ... I am to a greater or less degree, in the condition which God desired me and all to be in..."²

The assurance that this faith in the Father gives us, is above the realm of the usual view of assurance. Men generally

1. Memorials, Vol. I, p. 62.

2. Whole Proceedings, Second Part, p. 314.



thought of assurance as a feeling of certainty that a future salvation; a sure entrance into Heaven was provided for them. In consequence, there was a more or less inexpressed popular recognition that to claim such assurance, savoured of arrogance and irreverence. It was only the saint or near-saint who would receive popular approval to any such claim. But we are now seeing a view far advanced beyond these notions. A new and purer faith is here, just because there is a new and purer view of God.

Our first consideration is no longer safety for ourselves against future punishment. Our prime motive is not for assurance against the tortures of hell. Not this, but in the new light of the love of God, we see Him as He is, and we find ourselves repentant, sorrowful that we ever could have strayed from Him, whom, while we were yet sinners loved us and cared for us. Our desire is to live in the light and power of that love which has been revealed to us. We are no longer seeking safety first, but seeking the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all other things may be added unto us in God's good pleasure, whom we confidently trust for the life that now is and that which is to come. "Sin and holiness, not destruction and salvation in what may be called their aspects of suffered pain or infinite happiness, were the great opposed realities which gave importance to my work as a minister."¹

This is assurance in Campbell's teaching. Assurance is of the essence of faith, when faith rests in a God who is like Christ, whom we see in Christ.

1. Rem. & Reflec., p. 143.

It must be already manifest that Campbell believed deeply in the power of goodness to propagate itself by its own inherent attractiveness and beauty. Evil must be overcome by good. The religious life must be awakened and stimulated by love and not fear. That sin does bring punishment there is no doubt, and there is no intention to minimize the fact. God does condemn sin and Campbell does not leave this out of account as his sermons attest. But the sinner who is made aware of God's love to him, sees the horror of evil and assents to God's condemnation of it. He now sees the justice of God which punishes sin, and he turns away from evil because it is evil and not good. And he is brought to a state of mind in which confidence is an integral part. "No person can really and truly believe that which God has revealed of himself without.....a most undoubted trust in God for all that his soul desireth..... This trust in God I hold to be inseparable from the exercise of true faith.."¹

We can appreciate what a difference this teaching would make to those to whom Campbell ministered. Faith in God and assurance, if not altogether synonymous, are decidedly complementary. Faith was belief in God's testimony of Himself which they had seen in the Atonement and forgiveness; while the assurance of faith was really a confidence in the reality of this testimony. Faith was the content or substance of their hope, and assurance was the confidence in its reality.

Here we have indeed a religious teacher of consequence. His pupils were cut loose from every bond of legalism, at liberty to

1. Whole Proceedings, Part Two, p. 189.

enjoy a freedom of spirit. No longer were they to continually examine themselves. They were not to fear self-deception. We can almost hear Campbell say, "You may feel assured that your faith is of the right kind if you are completely trusting in God to accomplish His will in you." And you will increasingly grow in assurance as you appreciate more and more the kind of God you have, whose love you have seen manifested towards all.

Past sin is not at all an insuperable barrier. What Campbell is trying to convey is, that faith is veritably a redemption in itself, for it makes a new man by virtue of the power which the contact with God has created. Campbell says to his people that this faith will assure you by its very nature that it is a real and proper faith. It will indeed be a saving faith, for it will save you from your sins and endow you with eternal life; the abundant life which is hid with Christ in God. It is the Kingdom of God within you, and is a present possession.

This doctrine is held to be Scriptural in the sense that it is in accord with the spirit of Christ. It is not found specifically stated as here expressed, but it is in sympathy with Scripture. Campbell thinks the Bible assumes assurance to go hand in hand with faith. "The Scriptures everywhere assume that to believe in God's expressed love, and to be assured of it are the same thing." He pointed out that there is no question that the Gospel calls us into a life with God, which is intended to give peace. The "peace with God to which the Gospel calls us, is simply the contemplated result of the revelation which the Gospel makes of the love of God in its relation to us as sinners!

Furthermore, this faith is a quality rather than a quantity. It is an attitude rather than a measure, and because it is so, faith justifies us in the sight of God. It is what God expects from us. Our faith may not be so rich in content as it would be were we comprehending all the beauty and love of God, yet so long as it is a confident trust in the Father of Jesus, it is a justifying faith, though we but dimly see or only faintly comprehend the full content of that love towards us. This is the only possible view which can set at rest the "awakened sinner" and lead him in the path of peace. He must not be allowed to toss in turmoil, speculating as to whether his faith is more or less, sufficient or insufficient to warrant assurance. Conversion must be made free from such irrelevant elements. If faith is present, however small, it is faith, and God calls it good, and the sinner is justified by that faith. For, even though faith may not be full orb'd, and the individual exercising it be in a childish state of mind, yet that individual could not be more right in his attitude than he is in placing his trust in God, and he is therefore justified in the sight of God.

On this basis, conversion is freed from morbidness and the violent excitement which sometimes attends it, when the right view of God is taken. "I am satisfied that there is an unhealthy occupation with conversion, which hinders the development of the life of Christ within us." "In truth, in the time of conversion, it is not 'that we are converted', but that we apprehend Christ which is our peace; and this is that 'beginning of confidence', which to hold to the end, makes us to be of the household of

faith."¹

Faith is thus entirely separated from any degree of self-righteousness on our part. We bring with us no merit of works; we can take no egotistic credit in the abundance of our faith. Our basis of confidence in approaching God is the love which God has Himself bestowed while we were yet sinners. By apprehending that feeling in God to us, we acquire the assurance to cry, "Abba, Father", and place all trust in Him for the bestowal of the Spirit which makes us no longer servants, but sons, heirs of God through Christ.

Conclusion.

We have in Campbell's understanding of faith, simplicity itself. It is the simple faith discovered in religious experience at its highest, i.e. faith which is a response which comes from apprehending the long suffering love of God, richly manifested in Christ. Faith for us becomes that same kind of natural response to love which Christ called forth in those about him. It is a trust and confidence in something we see for ourselves and experience; a confidence in love going forth to meet us. And every one who comes to God in that faith is acceptable to Him and is assured of that acceptance. The degree of our faith is not a right subject for our introspection. Do we have faith to believe God's testimony concerning Himself? If so, we have the beginning of confidence and are reconciled to God, and we will have the assurance which is the essence of faith.

¹.Memorials, Vol.II, p. 98.

Chapter III.

The Heresy Trial.

The minister at Row had gone about his pastoral duties with complete devotion. The doctrines we have discussed, emerged from the attempt to live religion as a life rather than as dogma. The result was a victory for the vitality of religion in transforming human lives. Assurance and confidence had been looked for, and they had come into being. The theological outlook which had dampened religious enthusiasm, disappeared. Religious obligation and duty had turned into a love for righteousness, and men were worshipping God out of a sheer desire for the beauty of holiness. And even today in the Parish of Row, the effects of that achievement have not died away.¹

The world outside did not know these things. It had no appreciation of the new spirit coming upon the Row Parish, but it had heard of the new doctrine. The catchwords had gone abroad, and Row was associated with Universal Atonement, Universal Pardon and the Assurance of Faith. These were terms potent to arouse controversy. Much interest and discussion were created, but Campbell was not looking for trouble, nor did he as yet suspect it. His communicants' class was full, his people were visited, the church was alive and many lives were being changed. He went steadfastly

1. The present parish minister at Row, Rev. R. B. Scott, informed the writer that there is an intangible, yet unmistakeable spirit of Campbell's work still present. He gave a religious impetus which is still recognized and greatly cherished. Other parishioners, two of whom remembered Dr. Campbell, spoke in the same vein.

about his work.

However, the seed of dissension was in the wind. Row, by nature a rather secluded spot on the Gare Loch near Glasgow, possessed those natural beauties which attract summer visitors and vacationists. And it was these summer colonists who carried to the religious world at Edinburgh and Glasgow the new doctrine, producing a "considerable sensation." Shorthand notes of the Row sermons also appeared in pamphlet and book form. Opportunity now came to speak and preach outside of the parish. Advantage was taken of these openings from time to time. There was a great eagerness to hear the Row minister and a marked degree of cordiality was sometimes shown, particularly by divinity students.

The subjects of Faith and Assurance became the topics of the hour in theological circles and ministerial meetings. At one of these gatherings in Glasgow, Campbell was asked to give his view after the scheduled speaker had read a paper on Assurance of Faith. He did so, and many of those present replied to him in turn. He went away quite happy for all had spoken "very courteously," and his hopes were high that his views were not so unacceptable to his brethren after all. Campbell did not realize that the rest of that group went away quite satisfied also that they had been so successful in showing him his error.

The enlightenment came the following week. Campbell was to preach in Glasgow on a week day. Most of the Glasgow ministers were there. From the previous experience Campbell came full of encouragement, and once more poured forth his understanding of Christian faith. But he soon discovered that he had not removed the prejudices to his views at the previous meeting, and that his

audience of ministers was greatly offended to hear him, "so shortly after, state so fully what they had condemned." From this occasion Campbell dated the general opposition in religious circles which soon began.

The state of mind at the time is well revealed in the criticism against other fresh angles of truth preached by Campbell. He was not a one stringed instrument. He had more than one arrow in his quiver. On the occasion of another opportunity to address a clerical meeting, he strove to keep the taboo doctrines in the background. He chose as his topic; "Confessing Christ." This is one of his best sermons. He expresses the idea that our belief in Christ by a confession of him, demands all of life. If we are really confessing Christ in our lives, then we must strive to be a living record of the truth which we see. To confess Christ before men is to glorify God by the kind of life we live. The Christian should have, as it were, the name of God written upon him, that it may be read, and when so seen of men, it should awaken admiration and call forth praise. "We are to be living epistles of the truth, open and read of all men, and there is nothing by which others take knowledge of us, to which the obligation connected with this does not extend."¹

When even this message was opposed by the clergy, there could be little likelihood of gaining headway with doctrines already being branded as contrary to the word of God and the standards of the Church. For when Campbell began to preach the universal ex-

1. From sermon, Confessing Christ Jno. 12:46. Pamphlet bound together with a small collection of other sermon pamphlets printed at this period. Library of New College, Edinburgh.

stent of the Atonement, many neighboring pulpits were closed to the Row minister and opposition soon took definite shape. This came in the form of a memorial presented to the Presbytery of Dumbarton, March 30, 1830, asking the Presbytery to investigate and deliver the parish from the erroneous views being taught. The memorial was signed by twelve people living in the parish, not all of whom were of good reputation. But at the same time, as an offset to this memorial, there appeared another one signed by eighty heads of families testifying their attachment to Mr. Campbell and hoping that nothing would be done, "to weaken the hands of so faithful a minister of the gospel." This memorial in favor of Mr. Campbell the Presbytery refused to accept, but ordered the other to be laid on the table.¹

After a parochial visitation in the parish of Row, the Presbytery recommended the memorialists to convert the memorial into a libel, which was done. This libel indicted Campbell for preaching the doctrine of universal atonement and pardon, and the doctrine that assurance is of the essence of faith, which it stated were contrary to the Holy Scripture, the Confession of Faith and specifically condemned by the Fifth Act of the General Assembly 1720. This major charge was followed by ten alleged examples of Campbell's teaching, derived from sermon reports and hearsay.

The heresy trial had begun. Then followed the long, tiresome and unprofitable journey through Presbytery, Synod and General Assembly. The amount of detail is voluminous. The speeches with their endless debate, and the examination of witnesses, make a

1. Whole Proceedings, V - vii.

large tome useful as a source, but not requiring reproduction here. In reading this material, the reader is struck by the calibre of the witnesses appearing for Campbell. The laymen who appeared on his behalf were far superior to those of the opposition. Their intellectual grasp and clarity of expression in declaring the Row teaching, is a remarkable contrast to the crude and disjointed account of the opposing witnesses. The type of men who rallied to Campbell arouses our respect for the young minister. A turbulent zealot could not have attracted such men. Among them were an Edinburgh advocate, a publisher, a captain in the Royal Navy and the American Consul.

It is possible to submerge the details of the various stages of the case, and allow the main features to stand out. The trial may be reduced to a few central lines of attack and defense, and with these alone we are concerned.

Relation to the Marrow Controversy.

There are certain peculiar features of this trial, which when recognized over against each other, almost inevitably foreshadow the ultimate result. There is an open sesame which reveals the attitude of the church at large and the prosecution in particular. It is the phrase in the libel that these doctrines, "were moreover condemned by the Fifth Act of the General Assembly held in the year seventeen hundred and twenty...."

This Fifth Act is a pivot around which swung much of the pro and con of the discussion. Its importance for the explanation of the church's attitude has apparently not been recognized hitherto.

The church was not unfamiliar with the terminology used in this debate. Universal atonement, pardon and assurance were terms which the church had dealt with officially in times past. They were springing up again, and the suggestion naturally expressed itself that there was a precedent already established for this particular brand of heresy. The precedent was the Fifth Act of Assembly of 1720, and the Seventh Act of Assembly 1722, explanatory of the earlier Fifth Act.

Constant reference was made to the Act of 1720. "This Act of 1720 I must again speak to; for it appears to me that the reference to this act forms a most important part of this libel." The doctrines of Campbell are "expressly connected with the Act of 1720"! The opposition claimed until the very last that the teaching now being propagated at Row, had been condemned years before by the Act of 1720. In view of the importance which this earlier statute had in this trial, it is necessary to give some attention to it, and the occasion which called it forth.

The Act of 1720 had outlawed a book entitled, "The Marrow of Modern Divinity," a remarkable book with an interesting history. This book in two parts was written by Edward Fisher, and first published in London 1645. It is composed of religious dialogue in which Evangelista, a minister of the gospel instructs both Antinomista and Nomista, setting both in their rightful place. This work passed through a number of editions, and from the very first had a reputation for Antinomianism.²

1. General Assembly speech summarizing the prosecution, "General Assembly Proceedings."

2. In 1646 appeared a pamphlet purporting to be a discovery of its errors.

It was the edition "reprinted at Edinburgh 1718 with an ample recommendation prefixed thereto which they (Assembly) found was dispersed and come into the hands of many of the people,"¹ which caused the famous Marrow Controversy. This edition published in Scotland with a recommendation by a well known minister of the Church of Scotland, Mr. Hogg, caused a fury of protest, which to us seems out of all proportion to the cause. Pamphlets favorable and unfavorable appeared. The author and contents of the volume were roughly handled.² There was an attack on this "Snake in the Grass," and then "An Answer to the Snake" etc. The preface of one had the hygienic intention to be "of use to prevent the spreading of the Antinomian gangrene of that book."³

The result of it all was an Act of Assembly, the Fifth 1720 prohibiting all ministers "by preaching, writing or printing to recommend said book or in discourse to say anything in favor of it." In fact the Act "conjoined and required ministers to warn and exhort their people in whose hands said book is or may come, not to read or use the same."

Furthermore, the Act specifically condemned The Marrow of Modern Divinity for teaching the doctrines of universal atonement and pardon and assurance as of the essence of faith. They denounced these because of the antinomianism lurking in the ideas ex-

1. Fifth Act of Assembly 1720.

2. In the preface of a vol. "The Antinomianism of the Marrow.. Detected" by Hadow 1721, Edw. Fisher is referred to as a London barber who weedled his way into the ministry and served an independent church. But the truth is Edw. Fisher, M.A. was "the eldest son of a knight, became a gentleman commoner of Brasen-nose College Aug. 25, 1627." From Wood's Athenae Oxoniensis vol. II, p. 198, quoted from an edition of the Marrow of Modern Divinity - Edin. 1827.

3. Most of this material was derived from several vols. of old pamphlets in Tolbooth Parish Church Library, Edinburgh.

:pressed in the volume. But the doctrinal terms as here stated, do not appear anywhere in the Marrow of Modern Divinity. These terms are labels by which the General Assembly Act chose to characterize the teaching of the dialogues. The book does not set out to present a systematic exposition of doctrines called by these names. So Campbell is not adopting the terminology of the Marrow, but has unfortunately fallen upon the very phrases which appear in the Fifth Act of 1720.

The libel against Campbell is thus technically correct in holding that the Row teaching of universal atonement and pardon and assurance of faith had been condemned by the Assembly Act of 1720, for the Assembly actually did place official disapproval on this form of words at that time. That these terms now had a different content from what they had in the controversy more than one hundred years previous, was never admitted by the opposition despite every effort to convince them. It was generally accepted that Campbell was teaching what was taught before and must likewise be condemned. This was not only the tacit, but the expressed understanding throughout the trial. One of the very last speeches in the trial was by a professor of theology who said, "The Reverend appellant cannot disguise from himself that the Act I refer to, pointedly condemns in all its branches, the doctrine which he espouses." Thus the act which had condemned the Marrow of Modern Divinity was thought sufficient for the present case.

A careful examination of the Marrow of Modern Divinity would have done much to dispel this illusion. Certainly in perspective we must conclude as to the antinomianism of this book, that the church was over exercised; and in the second place, its supposed

affinity with Campbell was greatly exaggerated. We can say that the Marrow book published shortly before the formulation of the Westminster Confession, was a more or less worthy attempt to clarify the real character of faith.¹ It desired to distinguish clearly between the legal principle, which is called the Covenant of Works, and the Christian principle or Law of Christ. The exposition is clear that though we must do right, it is not on the basis of our literal fulfilling of the moral law that we receive salvation. Our justification is by faith alone, by placing our trust, not in the works we do, but in the righteousness of Christ which is a gift of love to us.

The expressed intention of the book is to defeat the least license of antinomianism, and it is true that Antinomista fares very badly in the dialogue. The book not only does understand the difference between faith and works, but sees a proper place for each. "Both the law of Christ and of works say, 'Do this,' but here is the difference; the one saith, 'Do this and live'; and the other saith, 'Live and do this'. One saith, 'Do this for life'; the other saith, 'Do this from life'."² This quotation represents the intention and spirit of the book. Nevertheless, there is a great deal of reckless language, which easily lends itself, in fact provokes the charge of antinomianism. There are occasional statements which suggest that the Christian has nothing more to do, as all has been done for him.³ Passages of

1.Rev.John Brown of Haddington in appendix to Thomas Boston's edition of "The Marrow of Modern Divinity", states that there had been "a flood of legal doctrine", and that the Marrow was intended to counteract that influence. (Tolbooth Parish Church Library).

2.Marrow of Modern Divinity p.157 - Thos.Boston edition.

3.Ibid. p.98.

this kind were seized upon and severely criticized, providing the material which stigmatized the book as antinomian. But we would agree with the statement of a prominent churchman, "In my opinion the language used in *The Marrow of Modern Divinity* is frequently unguarded, and the doctrinal statements sometimes incorrect..... But I also think that the Act of Assembly is liable to similar objections, that the alarm occasioned by the Marrow doctrines was somewhat greater than was necessary, and that it led to declarations as unsound as anything in the productions by which it was excited."¹

Those parts of the Marrow dialogue which provided material for the outlawed doctrines are in quantity very small. Their theological setting and direction are not very well thought out, and are certainly different in scope and content from the more balanced position of Campbell. The author of the Marrow does not find in the atonement the revelation of the love of God which it had for Campbell, though he strives for it. The atonement is in terms of God's wrath appeased and does not go beyond Anselm.²

It would be difficult for the Marrow to escape the charge of universal acquittal of sin which can be logically pressed upon it. The author's intentions were of the best, but he was caught in the Calvinistic web. We see him desirous of believing in the love of God to every creature, so he extends the atonement without breaking in any way from its legal forms. In consequence, it is not easy to evade the charge of universal salvation which attends such an atonement, nor the antinomianism which runs

1. "Universal Pardon" Dr. A. Thomson, Edin. p.479.
 2. cf. ^{Marrow of} ~~Modern~~ *Divinity*, pp. 86-98.

along with it. The Marrow writer apparently saw the antinomianism lurking here, so he devoted about nine tenths of the whole book to the error of antinomianism, vindicating the spirit of Christ as supreme. This, however, could not banish the antinomianism inherent in his salvation scheme.

The undaunted theologian desired to find an assuring faith, but election stared him in the face, so with more courage than depth of knowledge he tilted with it in the lists. He had a temporary success, and like Calvin hid election in the secret counsels of God. Then he went to the convert with the universal offer of salvation, urging the believer to tacitly forget election and "close with Christ in the promise", without any further questions. Assurance would then follow. The Marrow is only on the outskirts of faith, but does not fully understand it nor appreciate its theological setting. The author quotes greatly from Luther but does not manage to reproduce him.

How far apart the teaching of the Marrow is from that of Campbell on the subjects under consideration, a comparison makes clear. There is a wide difference at every point, but who on the opposition realized it? Strangely enough no one opposing Campbell sufficiently examined the two positions so as to see and admit any difference.¹ Yet, Robert Story, who staunchly defended Campbell, called attention to it with force. Story should receive our highest respect for his courage and untiring endurance in his

1. There is a curious exception. One of the ministers who gave proof in the prosecution had published a pamphlet against the Row Heresy. In it he made a point of the wide divergence between Campbell and the Marrow. He did it for the purpose of showing that he and kindred minds were "the true Marrow men," and not Campbell.

friend's defense from the beginning to the very end of the trial. He in particular brought to the attention of the Assembly a very clear statement on this Marrow difficulty, pointing out the incorrectness and injustice of linking Campbell with it. He showed that the Marrow expressions on atonement, pardon and assurance were conceived of in an entirely different light. It was because he knew so well the Marrow position and rejected it so decisively, that he could so emphatically declare to the Assembly how different was the teaching of the accused. He was therefore justified in saying to the Assembly that the Act of 1720 was no precedent for dealing with the content of the views on trial. Although similar terms were employed by the appellant, "they were obviously the symbols of very different meanings."

But the fact remains that Campbell's position, not at all that of the Marrow, was thought by the church to be sufficiently similar to warrant a similar ban. However, the church is not without some justification here. As a rule a label satisfies us as to the contents of a bottle, and if Campbell by putting on the old label suggested to people the well known brand, they ought not to be blamed too harshly. Story appreciated better than Campbell the danger stored in these terms. Just as in the past, evolution, whatever else it meant, made people see monkeys in man's family tree, so too with the terminology in this discussion; whatever Campbell meant by it, its customary meaning had run farther than the real explanation which slowly trudged behind.

Campbell should have known that these terms had an ill repute with the elite. He must have been aware that they were

acknowledged to haunt only the side streets of theology, but it does not appear that he knew them to have been officially denounced in 1720. He does not seem to have been at all aware of this fact.

When seeking to characterize the conclusions to which his thinking had brought him, Campbell cast about for suitable terms. The intention was present with him to find words which would command attention and for a very definite reason. In a letter to his sister¹ he says, "I know....I might publish...the truth without challenge if I avoided....innovations in language...But I would pass without challenge only because I would not be understood; because, through false associations formed with right words, I might be saying the right thing and yet convey a false meaning." This feeling is further brought out in a statement made to the General Assembly pointing out his reasons for adopting these terms.

"My reason has been this, I found that in the process of time, words fully expressive of an unqualified and unconditional gospel, have so lost their meaning, that people, in hearing them, have felt no real freeness to be expressed. I have seen that men have declared, as to themselves, and taught others, that the gospel was truly unconditional - that the love of God was given freely, and that there could be nothing on our part to entitle us to any confidence in God, who at the same time, have had no personal assurance towards God. How did this arise? Their words, if they had any meaning, implied that they were certain there was no reason why they might not rejoice in God; but their hearts told another tale; and they have confessed that they did not feel in a condition to rejoice in God. What could be the secret of this? Just that the words in themselves, so expressive of freeness, had lost that meaning;.... Considering this matter, I was further led to see that the feeling on the part of those who use this language of 'free salvation', but whose hearts were under the

1. Memorials, vol. I, p.64 - letter written 1829.

power of a conditional system of God's favour, was that the believing and the repenting did, somehow or other remove some present obstacle.....They felt as if the love of God to them was somehow suspended upon an act of theirs; and that somehow it was not personal until they had made it personal. I knew that this was not the truth of God; but that the forgiving love was the thing to be believed;....and that this love was love to the unconverted man; to the ungodly, that it was a love cherished to me while I was unconverted, which was to be to me the source of my confidence in approaching God. I therefore, sought to bring out this truth of things in words that could not veil it.."¹

Surely the doctrinal terms so sincerely conceived for so worthy a purpose, did duty quite beyond all expectation of them. But the explanation throws a different cast on the criticism which suggests itself. Campbell was not intentionally careless and he had a very worthy aim. The explanation given to the Assembly coincides well with the Row situation portrayed in the first chapter. When we consider the religious atmosphere with its background of fear, and the absence of both assurance and gladness of heart, we can well appreciate the necessity for words which would convey greater hopefulness. But it was an unhappy selection of words for the purpose, and their coincidence with the terminology of the Act of 1720 is regrettable, providing as they did so suitable a setting for trouble.

Story was dissatisfied with Campbell's formula, though in sympathy with its contents. It is true he says, "that the object of faith presented to all in the gospel is God in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, not imputing unto men their trespasses. He is not forgiving any in his sins so as to deliver him from judgment, and therefore, although intended to express

¹.General Assembly Proceedings, p. 55.

a true thing and a most blessed reality in the revealed character of God; the proposition alluded to, and for holding which he (Campbell) has been condemned, is not a sound form of words."¹ Certainly in the light of the circumstances it is easy to share this feeling, at least on the matter of pardon. Universal pardon had an unsavoury reputation and was regarded as the handmaid of antinomianism despite its employment in the new situation. It was a legal term and carried the legal atmosphere with it, and for that reason alone it would have been better if Campbell had shunned it altogether.

It is extremely unfortunate that there was this identity in terms between Campbell and the act of Assembly of more than one hundred years before. For this is the main cause which contributed so largely to the general misunderstanding characteristic of this trial. Moreover, it also accounts very largely for the impatient attitude so plainly discernible; an impatience which if expressed would have said, "We have settled this thing once before, let us nip it in the bud quickly and have done with it." This sameness of terms is a most peculiar feature of this strange trial.

If Campbell had known how general would be the misunderstanding created by his phraseology, and could have had any intimation of how difficult it would be satisfactorily to explain

¹.Memoir of Robert Story p.190. "He ought to have done as day after day I entreated him;at once disavow the expressions and express his resolution never to use them but as Scrip warranted, provided he was permitted..to preach to every sinner the forgiveness of sins,declaring that nothing prevented his return to God but his own unbelief of God's love."

himself in view of the misunderstanding, it is only reasonable to suppose he would have striven for another form of words. But in any case, when the trial was upon him, it was too late to set these terms aside, for he would avoid any semblance of recanting for the sake of soft treatment. The adoption of a new formula at the last moment might suggest an effort to hide the real teaching. There was to him no other course but the manly one of stating plainly and sincerely what these doctrines were to him, and how he expounded them to his people.

He thought at the outset he would have no difficulty in explaining himself and that this would clear the issue, but this was a vain hope. If Campbell had had a less ambiguous symbol, it is conceivable that he would have met with greater tolerance. However, it is not likely that this would have made any difference to the final result. For as a matter of fact, the trial was not confined to the discussion of Campbell's relation to the Act of 1720. This, of course was an important lever of technicality which supported the prosecution. But even if Campbell could have undermined the influence of the Act of 1720, there was still the Westminster Confession in the way.

The Westminster Confession in the Trial.

The Westminster Confession was also brought into action. This was called for in the libel, for the defendant was charged with teaching doctrine contrary to the Confession of Faith. And, furthermore, the Act of 1720 had the Confession as its sanction. In consequence, the church launched itself upon the accused with the authority of the Confession, while Campbell in turn adroitly

attempted to decrease its force by wounding this arm of authority,

The defendant undertook to show that the Westminster Confession of Faith did not contradict his views, though he was aware it did not declare them. He did not think the Confession taught what he was teaching, but he did think he could maintain that the Confession did not specifically oppose his ideas. It is obvious there is not much standing room here, and the effort was not conspicuously successful. We shall find him realize later on that he and the Confession do not have a great deal in common after all. But some of the statements which Campbell has to make concerning the Confession are of considerable interest and value.

In leading up to his defence on the Confession, Campbell provided a historical setting beginning with the Reformation. He also used various confessions of faith and other works of authority and prominence in Protestant churches which had been designed to refute Romanism. His object in going back to previously existing standards was, "to show that that truth of God which I have taught, has hitherto, with more or less clearness, been confessed to by the visible church." When Campbell says, "with more or less clearness", it is plain that he does not expect to find the exact form of his ideas in the past. But words such as "assurance" had played a large part in church history, and wherever he can find any historical sanction for using the word, he is ready to use it.

The Church of Rome in the Catechism of the Council of Trent was shown to hold to a universal atonement, "Christ hath made satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." But, on the other hand, it emphatically denied assurance to be of the essence of

faith.¹ The Reformers protested strongly against the Roman Church, not at all because of the extent of the atonement, but on the subject of assurance of faith they protested. The early confessions of faith and the early Protestant literature abound in phrases that Christ died "for all the world," and for "the sin of all mankind";² while on the matter of assurance there is a vast amount of material to show that assurance was considered as of the essence of faith.

There surely can be no question that the reformers stressed strongly, not only the privilege of the Christian to have assurance, but that this confidence belonged to the nature of faith.³ Of this the early confessions and catechisms bear abundant testimony.⁴ The definition of true faith in the Palatine Catechism approved by the Church of Scotland 1590, declares faith to contain, "an assured confidence," which includes the certainty that "forgiveness of sins, everlasting righteousness and life is bestowed not only upon others, but also upon me"...This catechism

1. Canon 12 of the Council of Trent - "If any man shall say that justifying faith is nothing but confidence in the mercy of God, who remitteth sins for Christ's sake, or that that confidence is it alone by which they are justified, let him be accursed."

2. See Conf. of Faith, Eng. Congregation at Geneva (approved by Ch. of Scot.); Catechism of the Ref. Ch. of the Palatinate used by Ref. churches in Holland, Germany and by the Church of Scotland; Scotch Confession of 1560; (Dunlop's Collection of Confessions.)

3. This statement holds, even though assurance for Campbell does not have the precise meaning it had for the reformers.

4. The Augsburg Conf., Conf. of Helvetia, Conf. of Saxony and Conf. of Württemberg all bear out Campbell in holding assurance to be of the essence of faith. However, we have only quoted from confessions above approved by the Church of Scotland. Württemberg Conf. on pardon "We should have faith to this end, that as the gospel of ~~us~~ doth declare it, so we may assuredly believe that our sins are freely pardoned and forgiven for our Lord, Jesus Christ's sake."

emphasizes the individual trust in God which Campbell so strongly urged.

Campbell now goes on to say that, "It is far easier to multiply proofs that the Protestant church has everywhere held that assurance is of the essence of faith, and that personal confidence towards God, as the forgiver of our sins, is inseparable from the reception of the gospel, than that they held that doctrine of universal atonement and pardon through the death of Christ, which alone furnish a reasonable foundation for such assurance."¹

Having made this statement, and having referred to the reformers and the earlier confessions, Campbell is forced to admit that the Westminster Confession is not quite so favorable. "I hesitate not to admit that while in the confessions down to the date of the Westminster Confession I find distinct admissions of the universality of the atonement, I am not able to set before my brethren any such recognition in it - it only states what Christ has done for the elect - it does not state what has been done for others." But when the Westminster Confession was accepted, it was received as in nothing contrary to the existing standards previously sanctioned by the Church of Scotland and from which Campbell had quoted. Therefore, it was held that the Westminster Confession should not be allowed to declare limitation of the atonement, as this would be contrary to the previous standards. It was declared further, that there was intentional omission, in the Confession, of words which would unmistakably limit the atonement.

¹.Whole Proceedings, Part I, p.60.

There were historical explanations for this silence. The Westminster divines were not at all of one mind as to the extent of the atonement. Many favored a limited atonement but many did not. Specific announcement of the limitation of the atonement would not have been sanctioned, and it would not have represented the united feeling of the Westminster Assembly. Both positions could be served best if no definite statement on the extent of the atonement was made. However, the reader of the Confession cannot avoid the impression that the limitation group gained the honors for strategy. And this impression becomes the stronger when it is observed that the purpose which called the Westminster Assembly into being was far from having limitation of the atonement as one of its objects.

The Westminster Assembly had the Thirty Nine Articles as the basis of its deliberations. It was intended that the Assembly should free the Thirty Nine Articles from any misapprehensions which had arisen concerning them. The Articles of the Church of England provided the basis of doctrine, and these Articles as Campbell stated, are plain enough in the declaration of a universal atonement. Article thirty one speaks of the offering of Christ as "for all the sins of the whole world..." The Westminster Assembly was not called for the purpose of evolving new doctrine, and the Confession when completed was understood to be in harmony with the Thirty Nine Articles.¹ It was deliberately silent on the extent of the atonement. However, when it was

1.cf.A.F.Mitchell "The Westminster Assembly" The Baird Lectures 1882. Both Houses of Parliament, "looked on the new Confession as in substantial harmony with the old Articles." p.366.

received by the Church of Scotland, it was accepted as in nothing contrary to its existing standards, standards which declared the atonement as for all mankind..

It was generally held that the statements of election in the Westminster Confession were obviously sufficient as to the limitation of the atonement without any further assertion of the fact. Campbell thought it possible to argue that though redemption was limited to those who became saved, this need not limit the atonement itself. As a matter of fact, it would be difficult for anyone to deny that the Confession limits the atonement without actually saying so. Nevertheless, Campbell maintained that since the Westminster Confession was silent as to the extent of the atonement, and since it was produced and accepted as in harmony with the Thirty Nine Articles as well as in accord with the previous standards of the Church of Scotland, it should not be allowed to pass judgment at this point as though it had spoken.

The Westminster Confession is not a great deal more useful for Campbell when he turns to it on the subject of assurance. It is true the church standards antecedent to the Westminster Confession were clear enough in saying that assurance is of the essence of faith, but it takes a good deal of pressure to squeeze that doctrine from the Confession.

In the twenty fourth chapter, section two, there is a definition of faith. Here faith is regarded as believing to be true whatsoever is revealed in the Word, and that "the principal acts

1. Campbell's references to the Westminster Confession are historically correct. Cf. "The Westminster Assembly" by A.F. Mitchell, also "Confessions of the Church of Scotland" C.G.M'Crie.

of saving faith are accepting, receiving and resting upon Christ alone for justification, sanctification and eternal life, by virtue of the covenant of grace." The Larger Catechism defines justifying faith as, "not only an assent to the truth of ^{the} promise of the gospel, but a receiving and resting upon Christ and his righteousness therein held forth...." The Shorter Catechism also uses this term, "resting on Christ." Campbell then dexterously remarked that these words "receiving" and "resting", if we attach to them their natural meaning, teach confidence and assurance. Otherwise it would be necessary to maintain, "that we may receive Christ as a Saviour and yet not put trust in him as one - yea, that we may rest upon him, and yet it be no rest."

Campbell took into consideration those expressions in the Confession which "seem to give some sanction to the apology made for living in uncertainty as to God's love and favour towards us." Yet these expressions imply nothing more than a recognition of the liability to which we are all open, of occasionally doubting God's word. We all do this more or less, and we know it is not the right state, certainly not as a permanent condition. This condition should not be used as a reason to convince ourselves that we are permanently unworthy, and because unworthy, unable to find assurance and confidence. In this light the Confession would be favorable to Campbell. He really felt that its best expression and interpretation were on his side, especially such a statement as the answer to the thirty sixth question of the Shorter Catechism, where one of the fruits of the Christian life is "assurance of God's love" with its attendant "peace of conscience." But unfortunately in the Confession, much of the

"language used, from a feeling of tenderness to the dark state in which the children of God are sometimes found, has given rise to the practical feeling, in a great proportion of the members of our church, that a man may be a Christian who has never had the spirit of adoption at all." This is an attitude which ought not to be encouraged.

We could learn from the Reformers at this point. "While they so strenuously contended for the assurance of faith as essential to salvation, and that to believe the gospel was to believe the forgiveness of a man's own sins, they also recognized that, through the flesh a child of God may be at times in darkness and in doubt." So therefore, "I ask you to take the passages in which they make that admission, along with others in which they demand assurance, and you will find that, taken together, they contain what I demand as necessary to faith, and what I recognize as an interruption of faith."¹

The Westminster Confession, on the other hand, had overstressed this matter of uncertainty. In fact, in the face of

1. Campbell made special reference to Calvin showing that Calvin had emphasized assurance. And there is no question that in the Institutes we get considerable material indicating Calvin's interest in assurance and the necessity for it. "His quarrel with the Roman Catholic Church had been in no small degree due to the uncertainty in which its teaching left the individual regarding personal salvation. To a man of his spiritual temperament and mental complexion, such uncertainty was intolerable." Hunter, "The Teaching of Calvin." This bears out Campbell as does statements of Principal Cunningham, "Reformers and Theology of the Reformation" p. 119. However, it seems necessary to add that Calvin was himself responsible for adding those factors of doubt and uncertainty which later on found doctrinal expression in the Westminster Confession. "Yet experience shows that sometimes the reprobate are effected in a way so similar to the elect, that even in their own judgment there is no difference between them." Institutes Bk II, Chap. 3. Expressions of this kind along with others already referred to, added those elements of uncertainty which robbed the assuring statements of their intended effect.

the Reformation and post-Reformation expressions as to religious experience, Campbell was convinced that the Confession had fallen off considerably, and was lacking in religious vitality. Although on the subject of assurance the Westminster divines, "have not denied what those who went before them taught; yet, I feel they have taught it in a form of speech exceedingly cold, and unfit to do justice to the truth."

In consequence, the plea was made that the Confession should not be used as the final court of appeal, if the doctrines on trial were regarded as heretical. Should the Confession be made superior to Scripture? A charge of heresy, involving the possibility of deposition from the church, was such an awful and serious matter, that surely any teaching which warranted such a fate, ought to be condemned from the Scripture. Teaching so contrary to the church as to merit a sentence of banishment, should be plainly at variance with the Word of God. Thus Campbell pled with his brothers in the ministry to judge him by the Scripture. If he was as flagrantly at variance with the Scripture as he had been charged, then they ought to have little difficulty in making plain his departure from it. Moreover, it had always been recognized that in serious religious controversy, the Scripture should be superior to any standard of the church. The Westminster Confession itself enunciates this principle in the thirty first chapter, section four. It refers to councils and assemblies saying that they have frequently erred, and that their findings, "are not to be made the rule of faith or practice, but to be used as a help in both." The Scriptures were clearly understood to be the ultimate standard.

The opposition, however, was quick to repudiate the character of the defense just considered. They were not ready to be led into a field of Biblical debate which might lead on endlessly. And it was made emphatically clear again and again that the standards would not be in the least set aside. "It will not do for him to tell us that we must not judge him by the Confession." "...You must see very plainly and at once, that the only fair and conclusive arguments that can be used are not so much to be drawn from the Scriptures, as from the interpretation given to those Scriptures by the Church, and ratified by the State." "The church has specified distinctly what books contain the word of God, and she has also stated the doctrines which, as contained in the word of God, we are to teach."¹ So that, "In judging of the relevancy of any libel, you are to look to the standards - to those standards which the ministers of the church have sworn to - to those upon declaring his adherence to which, he takes his place as a minister of the church. Now upon that ground I say as to the libel - that it stands or falls by the Westminster Confession of Faith."

The attempt which had been made to numb the customary authority of the Confession was not very happily received. It was nothing short of scandalous in the general opinion to impugn the authority of the Confession. The Westminster Confession had attained a preeminent place in the mind of the church. It was the perfected expression of the Protestant church, and whatever had gone before could be regarded as nothing more than preparatory to

1. Whole Proceedings, Second Part, p. 250.

the perfected end. Such reverence for the Confession could only express indignation at Campbell's historical summary. His recital of facts in connection with the origin of the Confession found no warm welcome.

This displeasure found various ways of expressing itself. "You may just as well tell us about vitrified forts or anything else in natural history, as tell us about Geneva Confessions or Würtemberg Confessions or any other confession than the Westminster Confession to which all of us have subscribed in the most solemn manner." Suppose it is true that former councils or confessions held a universal atonement, "What is that to us?" These former documents had a place in the early days of the church's growth, "when she was yet young and unconfirmed" and "are not to be brought into competition with the mature and authorized determinations of her lawful and perfect years." The attempt at this late date to set aside the Confession as an authoritative standard in a heresy trial, deserved the severest censure. It was regarded as tantamount to the deliberate casting of contempt upon the standards of the church.

Audacity and insincerity were far removed from the personality of Campbell, but his attempt to circumvent the Confession by pleading for the privilege of being judged by those Scriptures which had yielded fresh angles of truth to his diligent search, was looked upon as mere speciousness. "And let it not be said in the Nineteenth Century that there are new discoveries to be made. There are discoveries to be made in philosophy, but as to a revelation given by God, it is an absurdity to suppose it." "If it be a revelation given by God and if it be intended for the

instruction of mankind, it is an absurdity to suppose that there can be any fundamental principle of that religion now to be discovered; and therefore, we are not to be making new discoveries as to the fundamental principles of the gospel."¹ If this is God's truth, how could it have been hid so long. Does he suppose "that the watchmen of our Israel have been slumbering at their posts?" "We may be thankful that all the doctrines of the gospel are embodied in the articles of the confession of faith. Therefore, it will not do for him to tell us that we must not judge him by that Confession."

As a result of this general feeling, the course of procedure was readily determined. "We have just to ask, is this the doctrine of the church or not?" The answer to that question could be settled only by a comparison of the views under fire, with the expressed statements of the Westminster Confession. There was no hesitation in proceeding to that task.

As to content, in the matter of refutation, there was not a great deal more material for the prosecution than there had been for the defense on the atonement. There was no direct statement of limitation to bring forward, but there was a strong argument from what the Confession unquestionably implied in this particular. One, "cannot read the Confession without the deepest conviction that by it, the atonement of Christ is limited to the elect." "That is unquestionably the impression which it conveys from beginning to end." Certainly these remarks should have our unqualified assent, and for the most part these allegations

¹.Whole Proceedings, Second Part, p. 275.

sufficed as to the attitude of the Confession on the atonement. Election was also used at this point to refute Campbell's claim of God's love to every creature, by eliciting from it what is surely latent within it; e.g. that "it is not common to all men that God is favourable to them." By the same token, universal pardon was thrown out as impossible and as nothing other than pure antinomian heresy.

The refutation of the doctrine of assurance, however, was comparatively easy for the protagonists of the Confession. No circuitous attack was necessary here, for the Confession was plain. In the eighteenth chapter it is clearly stated that Christians "may in this life be certainly assured that they are in the state of grace.....But this infallible assurance does not so belong to the essence of faith, but that a true believer may wait long, and conflict with many difficulties before he may be a partaker of it.." The eighty first question of the Larger Catechism also speaks of assurance of grace and salvation as "not being of the essence of faith", and "true believers may wait long before they obtain it." Other parts of the catechism are to the same effect. Quotations from the Confession and the catechisms appeared at frequent intervals throughout the trial and were regarded as final statements of the church's doctrine.

The conviction was pressed home from time to time that whosoever taught anything contrary to this doctrine, had thereby chosen a path leading outside the folds of the church. The responsibility was upon him who made the choice. It is indefensible and even a "moral breach" to teach that which is opposed to the doctrine which at ordination this minister pledged himself

to proclaim. His desire to remain in the church was impossible to grant since the "contract" had been broken. He ought not to expect to remain with us. "If conscience tells him that he cannot do the work of the church, it should likewise tell him that he ought not to eat the bread of the church." And therefore since the Confession was no longer the basis of Campbell's teaching, the suggested course of action was for the church to relieve him from its ministry.

Thus the church rested itself peacefully in the folds of the Confession. It was the flag around which the church could rally, and would that it might "continue without rent or stain to wave in full and unsullied protection over the heads of many a faithful and obedient generation.." Against this apparently impregnable position, Campbell made a final eloquent and touching, yet useless appeal.

"When the church says to both ministers and people, 'This is my Confession of Faith; if anything in it appear to you inconsistent with the word of God, I am prepared to go with you to the word of God to settle the matter;' then does the church speak according to her place. But if instead of this she says, 'This I have fixed to be the meaning of the word of God, and you cannot take any other meaning without being excluded from my communion; and to entitle me so to exclude you, I do not need to prove to you that what you hold and teach is contrary to the Scriptures, it is quite enough that it is contrary to my Confession of Faith;' I say, if the church of Christ use this language, she no longer remembers her place as a church."¹

"I lay it down as a principle that the church never took to herself the character of infallibility from the time she became a reformed church, and that any member of the church is entitled to express freely how far he believes that the church has been growing in grace; advancing or retrograding in knowledge.. The Westminster Confession has not set forth the whole truth.

1. Whole Proceedings, Part II, p. 202.

It is absurd to cry treason when criticism is passed on a document of this kind." What profit is it to think of our fathers in such a way, "and hold their opinions in such esteem, as will expose ourselves to the danger of following them in that in which they may have erred."¹

"It is an awful heresy that would invade the freedom of searching the word of God by the ministers of the church;" and to deny ministers the liberty "to bring forward for the edification of their people from the word of God, things new and old." "I entreat my fathers and brethren to remember this plain fact, that the church at no time has contained all the light that is in her living head...."

Campbell went on to say that the church should continually reach out unto those things that are before. Surely the Apostle in Philippians 3:13ff recognizes that the knowledge of those to whom he wrote was limited, and he teaches them to look forward and be progressive. We never say to an individual Christian that he should be satisfied with the knowledge unto which he has attained, nor do we expect him to say so, and, "What is true of individual Christians, is true of the church as a body." Do we really dare to say that we shall not be taught further? Shall we deny any further hearing of the Holy Spirit as it speaks to us? If a confession of faith implies such an attitude on the part of the church, then "in asking me to sign it, the church is asking me to disobey the command of Christ." "For surely our Lord requireth and teacheth us by the Spirit, that we should go on from grace to grace, and from knowledge to knowledge, 'till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.'" "If a confession of faith were something to stint and stop the church's growth in light and

knowledge, saying, 'Thus far shalt thou go and no farther', then a confession of faith would be the greatest curse that ever befel a church..."

The force of this appeal touches us deeply. This was the enunciation of a thoroughly sound principle. The eloquence and power of this appeal is able to move us only because we are not environed by the Westminster Confession. We are not encircled by its rigid grasp which holds on with a metallic strength, once we have succumbed to its major premises. The men whom Campbell addressed were for the most part thus encased, and on that account the profound feeling and sympathy flowing from a full heart, merely struck on cold steel. It may be hard for us to understand the power of that Confession. The final declaration of principle in Campbell's defense seems so acceptable. Who can still maintain that the Confession is a perfect interpretation of religious truth? Of course it is obvious to the student that the Westminster Confession is the most concrete embodiment of the Calvinistic theology. It is a symmetrical stronghold, duly buttressed and castellated; and from foundation stone to topmost turret it is Calvinistic thought reduced to geometric and mathematical form.

In view of the character of that Confession, Campbell's plea could not be allowed to take effect, even if there had been a disposition in that direction. It is quite conceivable that the defense did stir the natural feelings of some of the auditors, but nevertheless, it could not be conceded any official recognition. Where the Confession is strictly held to, variation cannot be admitted. This Calvinistic edifice, with all its

appearance of strength, had after all, a structural weakness. It was so constructed that a home thrust at any point, was a vital wound, and weakened every intersecting part. The Westminster standard can allow no concession which is in any wise at variance with what is already set down.

In the light of this situation, we can understand the attitude displayed toward Campbell. It was thought presumptive of + him to place new content and meaning into the words atonement, pardon and assurance. These terms had certain meanings prescribed by the Confession and they could have no other. In fact, the champions of the Confession had difficulty in seeing any sensible content in Campbell's teaching whatsoever. To them it was an illogical medley, and in the nature of the case they were helpless to avoid this conclusion. This could not have been otherwise, for the opposition were thinking of the atonement in one light, and Campbell in another. To their mind he was only extending the kind of legal atonement which they held. Campbell was not doing this, but he had not gone far enough in his thinking to be able to explain unmistakeably the difference in nature between his view and theirs. The universality of the atonement he saw, and he had the basic ideas which enabled him to see further, but he was unable to interpret them adequately at the time. He was caught in mid-air. Had the trial not come when it did, Campbell would have shaped these nebulous ideas into form and order. He would have done this, for the talisman was in his hand. He had discovered the love of God in the atonement.

Campbell was unable to make the matter clear to the orthodox, so they endeavoured to gore him by theological onsets.

"Mr. Campbell is at liberty to choose either horn of the dilemma to which he has reduced himself; either by maintaining on the one hand that Christ purchased redemption only for the elect, thus extinguishing his doctrine of universal atonement by nullifying its importance; or by admitting as he must of necessity otherwise admit, that Christ purchased redemption for those whom he calls non-elect, an admission, which, according to his view of redemption would infer the doctrine, not of universal atonement but of universal salvation."¹

If Campbell were viewing the atonement, as his judges thought he was, he would have been thoroughly impaled, for in that case the dilemma would have been unanswerable. But, the foregoing quotation is just to the purpose here in that it shows so well how the arguments against Campbell were not really applicable to him. The simple reason for this was, that the work and death of Christ was not viewed by the accused as purchasing anything. The atonement was not thought of by him as purchasing the elect or the non-elect; it was not thought of as the suffering which the elect would otherwise have had to suffer, any more than as the total punishment for the sins of the non-elect. It was not a ransom nor a payment in the literal meaning of those words. The atonement was first and foremost a revelation of the love of God to every one of the sons of men, and the suffering of Christ was regarded as a measure by which we can discern that long-suffering love of God to us. Campbell, it is true, had not fully seen as yet where this principle would lead him, nor had he completely

¹.General Assembly Proceedings, p. 110.

appreciated how much he had changed the entire conception of the atonement. However, it was dawning on him more and more as the trial progressed. The trial was the chemical touch which precipitated from his rich mind, the crystals held heretofore in solution. Through this ordeal he came, as through a refining fire, and it brought him to a place where he understood that he could no longer sign the Confession as an expression of his faith.

Yet, through it all, it is plain that he yearned to see a ray of hope within the church. He hoped that the church would at least go with him in recognizing in the atonement, a sufficient revelation that God loved the world and all creatures within it. Would not the church at least see that God desired that all men might come to themselves and seek to live as loyal sons of the Father?

Unfortunately this searching plea of Campbell was complacently regarded as altogether untenable. It was felt that any reasonable man would give this up when he was made to see how much out of harmony he was with the whole "scheme of salvation." They did not know that Campbell had found the lost chord of the Christian gospel, but questioned the calibre of his mind instead. To them Campbell seemed unable to comprehend the system, while the fact was, they did not comprehend him. They were moving on a legal plane. Campbell moved with a transfigured cross. As a result, they labored hard to refute what he did not hold at all.

This is another of those peculiar features in this anomalous trial. There was no seeing eye to eye. There was hardly a common point of contact between the two sides. The church forces never really understood the defendant at all. The prosecution

and defense were like two stars each moving in its own orbit, each far removed from the other. Campbell moved in a similar course, but in a wider ellipse. He saw their limits but was out of their range.

The extraordinary situation here outlined, helps us to view, yet without any feeling of bitterness, the condescension and occasional display of disdain and haughtiness, in what was otherwise a most courteous trial. It was a contest between gentlemen, however different in opinion. The chance bitterness, though very infrequent, was nothing other than impatience at what seemed to be Campbell's obtuseness. That he, an educated man, could or would not see the inescapable logic and completeness of the accepted theology, was to them a conundrum. For him to continue the entertainment of a few fantastic and ill-fitting ideas, which, in the opinion of most, had been fatally impaled on the horns of dilemma; this was beyond reason. Some became impatient, while others patronized the youthful theologian out of real sympathy or pity. But it is understandable, and under the circumstances, it is a tribute to the participants that bitterness and personal remarks were so little in evidence. There was genuine regret by many that this young and otherwise promising minister had fallen away. Their loyalty to what they believed to be the principles of the church, made it necessary for them to be against him.

The General Assembly Decides.

At this point we may assume that the evidence is all in, and now a decision must necessarily be reached. Would the church uphold the former judgment of both the Presbytery and the Synod

that the libel against Campbell was relevant? There was no sign anywhere which could give hope of a negative answer. It was generally understood that the appeal would be turned down. In accordance with that general feeling, the appeal was dismissed without a vote, and the sentences of the Synod and Presbytery affirmed.¹

It was midnight of the twenty fourth of May 1831 when this stage of the trial was reached. There remained the technical matter of proving the libel, this to be followed by the important question as to the final disposition of the case. There was a large number who desired to have the discussion adjourned until the following day. Many who had paid close attention to the contest, were fatigued by the many hours which they had concentrated upon it. Others desired to go more carefully over the printed evidence which had come only that day into their hands. But those who were desirous of finishing the matter without delay, and who were for the most part of the Evangelical party, called attention to other pressing business. As a result, a motion to adjourn was not carried. At this, a great number of the members went away, and the final act was played without them.

The night hours ticked by, while under the shadows of the adjacent castle where sentries moved in silence, the church was formulating its decision in one of the most important trials that disturbed its peace. The church had little difficulty in proving the libel. The evidence of witnesses against Campbell, gathered by the Presbytery was used, but more weighty still were the doc-

¹.General Assembly Proceedings, p. 145.

trinal statements and "attack" on the Confession by the accused himself.

There were those who had been able to prophecy to themselves the development of the case up to the present point. They were certain the General Assembly would uphold the Presbytery and Synod against the appeal of Campbell, and of course it then followed that the Assembly would almost certainly find proof for the libel. But no one could feel altogether sure about the final result. Would the church cast out the young man absolutely, or would it suspend him? Whatever the answer was going to be, it was being arrived at with very few of the members present.

While the trial droned on in these final hours, the self-possessed figure of Campbell observed, with enduring silence, his youthful dreams recede before him like a tide going out to sea. We can almost visualize this dramatic scene. Though he was the storm centre and had been found guilty of heresy, Campbell was yet calm. He had done all and was able calmly and patiently to wait. Somehow he sensed the impending judgment. He had seen the unrelenting zeal, alert to take the fullest measure of penalty. Those on the opposition most interested in prosecuting him, those most zealous to guard inviolate the standards, were prepared to educe the extreme sentence. To them deposition was the logical course, for it was thought that an irreconcilable conflict of principles faced them. "His opinions are at variance with those laid down by our standards." Since it was impossible for them to reconcile or make room for the defendant's teaching, and since he would not recant, "we must come to the melancholy and heart-rending conclusion that this reverend gentleman must go out from

among us..."

A motion was brought forward which stated, "that as Mr. Campbell has avowed and taught doctrines at variance with the word of God and the doctrines laid down in the Standards of the Church of Scotland, that he cannot continue in our communion - that we declare the Church of Row vacant..." This motion was seconded, but an amendment was suggested which would make the penalty of the Assembly a suspension sine die. This proposal was moved and seconded. There was thus at the last minute an alternative to absolute deposition.

Then occurred the most dramatic incident of the whole trial. An anxious spectator of these deliberations was the aged father of Mr. Campbell. As he presently stated, he was one of the oldest ministers present. The trial of the son was also an ordeal for the father, for both loved each other with deep affection. The heart of the father burned within him as he watched this painful process. This paternal figure finally arose and said:

"Moderator, I rise to request your permission to read to the house some papers which I hold in my hand, which should have been transmitted to you through your Committee of Bills, but they came too late. I have in my hands a letter from a most respectable individual of the parish of Row, well known to many in this house, accompanying a petition from many of the parishioners of that parish on behalf of Mr. Campbell their minister.

My dear Sir:

"I am requested to forward to you the enclosed petition of 420 of the parishioners, heads of families, and communicants, of the parish of Row, to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, expressive of their affection for your son, for his assiduous labours, and for the desire of spiritual knowledge which his godly zeal and piety, has excited among them. Any member of the Assembly from this neighbourhood, can testify to the high respectability of the petitioners. The petition has been drawn up, and signed within the last two days,

and had it not been from a fear of its reaching you too late, it would have been signed by the more distant parishioners, who were also desirous to express to the venerable Assembly, their love of their Minister, and their hopes that the connexion between them, which has been so productive of the fruits of righteousness, might not be severed. Those persons who have signed the petition, after deducting the members of the congregations of the two old established Dissenting Houses, form 19-20ths of the adult population of the parish. You will observe in some instances a father or a brother has signed, by desire, for other members of the family. Believe me to be,¹

My dear Sir,

Yours very faithfully,

.....

Petition.

"Unto the Venerable, the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland."

"...that whereas it has gone abroad throughout the country, from certain statements made in the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, to the injury of the Rev. John M'Leod Campbell, and prejudice of your Petitioners, that the Parishioners of Row are opposed to Mr. Campbell as their Minister, and that they were desirous that the connection between them should be broken by the removal of the said Mr. John M'Leod Campbell, their Minister. Your Petitioners beg leave, for themselves, to disclaim, before your Venerable House, most distinctly and solemnly their being opposed to Mr. Campbell or of their having any such desire. A few individuals only discontented with Mr. Campbell's ministrations, have carried on the prosecution against him, without the concurrence of your Petitioners - who now would most humbly make known to the Venerable Assembly, their affection and regard for Mr. Campbell of whose zeal and assiduity in performing his duties as their Minister, this cannot too strongly testify. And your Petitioners would further beg leave to assure the Venerable Assembly, that instead of desiring the connection to be broken between them, and their Minister, they earnestly pray, that any decision of the Venerable Assembly may not be such, as to deprive them, even for a time, of the watchful care of their Minister over their souls, whose assiduous and laborious endeavours for their good has excited, throughout the Parish, such a desire for spiritual instruction, such a searching of the Scriptures, such feeling regarding divine and eternal things, as had not formerly occupied so much of their attention, as the vast importance of the subject required. Your Petitioners are confident that the Venerable Assembly will not regard such a representation as this of

1. General Assembly Proceedings, p. 175 ff.

small importance, in reference to the ends of truth and justice, nor hear without satisfaction, that the great body of the Parishioners of Row do not regard themselves as injured by having so zealous and holy a man as their Minister, and will thankfully enjoy the continuance of his labours among them.

"In reliance on the wisdom and righteousness of the Venerable Assembly, and that their decision will promote the great ends of peace and concord,

Your Petitioners shall ever pray.

Row, 19th May 1831.

"It was stated from the other side of the bar, that Mr. Campbell's parish was against him. I have read these papers that this may be seen by the house to be untrue." Then, after a momentary interruption by a member who complained that he was out of order, the aged gentleman continued. "I am the oldest father at present in this house. I have been forty years a minister in this church. And I do not generally trouble you with long speeches, for, till last year, my voice was never heard in the Assembly, except to give a vote. It is gratifying to my feelings to state what I have now done, and it ought to be gratifying to yours; for you should be glad to hear that any one of your brethren has been useful in his parish and is beloved by his people. A great deal was said from the other side of this house about dealing gently and leniently with Mr. Campbell. Now I would just ask, where is the lenience and gentleness if you go into the motion on the table and cut him off *brevi manu* from the church. You have not done Mr. Campbell justice in attending to what has this day been laid before you..... Sir; I can say that I have never heard any preacher more earnestly and powerfully recommending holiness of heart and life. It was certainly what I never expected, that a motion on the table for immediate deposition should come from my old friend Dr....., but I do not stand here to deprecate your wrath. I bow to any decision to which you may think it right to come. Moderator, I am not afraid for my son, though his brethren cast him out. The Master whom he serves will not forsake him, and while I live, I will never be ashamed to be the father of so holy and blameless a son." And then as though in a final burst of anguish and affection, he added, what was after all prophetic, "Indeed sir, in this respect, I challenge any one in this house to bring forward any who can come into competition with him."

A more suitable climax could hardly be conceived, for it was ~~was~~ actually the last gun fired before the voting. It was more than a final shot; it was a broadside which might be expected to carry away some of the mere technical considerations. It ought

to have cleared the ground, making at least one fact stand out, e.g. that here was a man of Christian character, a force and power for good among his people. To say literally, "Away with him", involved great responsibility. Would theological differences give place and make room for Christian life and spirit?

The night was spent and the sun was up. Everyone was ready for the question. The roll call began. Replies must designate either the first or second motion. If for the first motion, it meant deposition; if the second, suspension. When the roll call was finished, the first motion had been carried by 119 to 6. Then followed the "solemn and deliberate judgment of the General Assembly." "In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, the sole King and Head of His church, and by virtue of the power committed by him to it, I do now solemnly depose Mr. John M'Leod Campbell, minister of the parish of Row, from the office of the holy ministry, prohibiting and discharging him from exercising the same, or any part thereof, in all time coming, under pain of the highest censure of the church; and I do hereby declare the church and parish of Row vacant from and after the day and date of this sentence."

The blow had fallen. As the meeting adjourned at 6.15 a.m., the unhappy exile walked away with heavy steps from this sad scene. This scene like a great drama, contained that flare of humour which serves to lighten the impending doom, but which makes more poignant the final moment. Erskine of Linlathen was present during these last hours of the trial. A strange incident suddenly brought his wit into play. The principal clerk of the Assembly was appealed to in reference to some question of procedure.

In the excitement of the moment he made a reply quite the opposite of what he intended. He declared that "these doctrines of Mr. Campbell would remain and flourish after the Church of Scotland had perished and was forgotten." Erskine, struck by this extraordinary remark, whispered to those behind him, "This spake he not of himself, but being High Priest - he prophesied."¹

But withal, the decision was a bitter experience for Campbell. Yet, it was not an unmixed evil. There was also a sense of liberation. His brethren had banished him, but he could at least explore the unfamiliar ground. He would prospect, and perhaps find treasures hitherto unknown. He had already gotten beyond the Westminster Confession. Accompanied by his friend Scott on this early morning walk, he was asked by his friend whether he could now sign the Confession, whereupon Campbell replied, "No. The Assembly was right, our doctrine and the Confession are incompatible."²

There can be no question that a great mistake was made in deposing Campbell. Understand it we can. We saw him wrongly identified with the Marrow Controversy, the content of his views misunderstood, and though on the matter of the Confession the church was technically correct, the attempt to supplant its authority was also against him. However, Campbell had pled for a recognition of the universal love of God, for the freshness of religious discovery and the right to look for and accept new

1. "Letters of Thomas Erskine of Linlathen," edited by William Hanna, second ed., Edin. 1878, p. 106.

2 Ibid. p. 106.

light breaking forth. The church denied the possibility of new revelation, and rested its case on a closed body of dogma. These various forces in conflict with each other enable us to understand the outcome of the trial. Notwithstanding this, a Christian character of the first magnitude was cast out, and herein was the great mistake. If standards can place a church in this predicament, there ought to be another principle regulating the power which these standards have a right to wield.¹

This notable event has been referred to as the greatest display of intolerance of which the Church of Scotland was guilty. Principal Shairp "never ceased to regard Mr. Campbell's deposition as the storming by the Church of her best prophet, the deliberate rejection of the highest light vouchsafed to her in his time."² Yet, in the impartial light of distance, it is possible to pass a lighter judgment. Intolerance there was to be sure, but an examination of the various factors which interplay in this unique trial, creates the impression that the entire responsibility ought not to be laid at the door of the church. The church, however, must bear the largest share of responsibility. The church

1. "The Westminster Assembly is another instance of the futility of attempts to secure unity of the church by insisting on uniformity of creed and ritual. Not only have all such attempts hitherto proved futile, but they have without exception been attended with the most deplorable consequences; involving the stronger party in the guilt of persecution and oppression and of depriving others of those very rights of conscience which they so clamorously demanded on their own behalf... So both parties in those unhappy collisions were equally injured, and the grand truth and spirit of Christianity received, between them, a death wound... By this shall men know that ye are my disciples, that ye love one another." Extract from "Life and Remains of Dr. Lee", Minister of Greyfriars and Professor of Biblical Criticism and Antiquities in Edinburgh University.
 2. see Principal Shairp and His Friends, Tulloch, "Movements of Religious Thought," p.151.

was wrong. It shut out a noble spirit. It should have given greater recognition to the Christian character of the accused. There was insufficient evidence of sympathy. Many of these unhappy features resulted, to a considerable degree, from misunderstanding. But Campbell contributed to that misunderstanding. He did so by his terminology and by his apparent inability to carry through the theological implications of his atonement theory, defining more clearly its nature.

It would be historically incorrect to leave out a few further facts. In speaking of a trial of this kind, and in referring to the judgment given, it is of course entirely correct to say that the church passed sentence of deposition. But when we use the collective noun 'church', the impression is created that the whole church was accessory to the fact. The church must of necessity bear the onus of the thing, but at the same time, we are not to infer that the zealous pursuit of Campbell by the prosecution and particularly the Evangelicals, represented the unanimous feeling of the clergy toward him. We cannot judge the whole body in the same way that we condemn the fanaticism of those who, even after the deposition, persecuted Campbell's father. The Presbytery of Lorne required Dr. Campbell to read from his pulpit a document condemning his son's teaching, and also to excommunicate any who went to hear him preach. Of course he refused. But it would be a libel to take this as an index of the general desire.¹

It is true that the only ministers who actively participated in defending Mr. Campbell, were Mr. Story, already mentioned, and

¹.Memorials, vol.I, p.102.

Mr. Wylie of Carlisle.¹ However, there was a sympathetic element present. It was not sufficiently expressive, but was none the less real on that account. At one point when an objection had been raised during a speech of Campbell, one member indignantly denounced the interruption. He said there were a number like himself who were trying to make up their minds, and if any other member had reached a conclusion, would he please keep it to himself. A real spirit of fair play was the attitude of most. When aspersions had been cast on the honesty of the defendant in making his replies, there were several who came immediately to the rescue. These champions suddenly aroused by the unjustified disparagements, replied in the same spirit as that of the Procurator in the Synod who said, "I certainly admire the manliness and honesty with which the gentleman has delivered his speech on so momentous a cause."

Furthermore, it is worthy of record that some members protested against the decision. Before the Assembly adjourned on the fateful morning, some of those present entered a dissent against this judgment.

But it is to be particularly noted that there was an angry outburst when the Assembly reopened, and the members who had missed the nocturnal sitting were made aware of the deposition.

1. Dr. Wylie was the father-in-law of Edward Caird. "Dr. Wylie was a courteous and gallant old gentleman with fine manners and speaking the dignified language of an earlier period, military in bearing, and soldierlike in temperament. He shared the friendship and the views, and would fain have shared the fate of Dr. Campbell of Row." "The Life and Philosophy of Edward Caird," by Sir Henry Jones and J.H. Muirhead, p.50.

One distinguished member addressed the Moderator saying, "Why, Sir, I should ~~as~~ soon have expected upon my return to this house to find yourself deposed as Mr. Campbell of Row."¹ There was considerable indignation that such a comparatively small number of members had taken so momentous a step. The fact is that the great proportion of the members of this Assembly of 1831 were not present at the voting.² Since so many were away, it is of course impossible to conjecture what would have occurred had they been present. It is certainly probable that a less drastic motion would have fitted the temper of the whole Assembly. But in any case there is real satisfaction for a later generation to know that the deposition of Campbell was not the unanimous verdict of the General Assembly and that it was openly denounced. How much silent protest there was we shall never know, but that it did exist, we have reason to hold.

There was one man who might have done something for Campbell in view of what we know was his opinion at the time. This man was Chalmers, a recognized church spokesman, and already his name was a power to conjure with. He did not desire to be a member of the Assembly in 1831. He knew of course that an appeal on the "Row Heresy" was an issue facing that ecclesiastical body. Campbell had hoped to enlist his favourable support, but Chalmers took no part in the Assembly proceedings. His biographer quotes

1.From the unfinished Memoir of Alan Ker by Robert Story quoted by Principal Story page 174 of Memoir of Robert Story.

2.There were 310 voting members of the Assembly in 1831.Only 125 votes were cast;a few present did not vote,thus about 58% of the General Assembly were absent while the zealous Evangelicals evicted Campbell from the church.

a letter in which Chalmers refers to the trial.¹ "In regard to Mr. Campbell...it would have required a whole month to have mastered recent authorship on these topics, and to have prepared myself to my own satisfaction for taking part in the deliberations of the Assembly regarding them." Surely none of the debaters were so profound but that offhand Chalmers could have added something of merit.

Here we observe a striking contrast. The recognized theological leader of the day confessed to the importance of the problems involved, and felt the need of much special preparation to do justice to the case. But men with far less theological insight, felt no hesitancy in reaching quick decisions with the occasional aid of prejudice. Where the ablest among them feared to tread with haste, an imposing number rushed with eager feet. Whether Chalmers had other reasons for refraining from public action we do not know. However, he never could have given his approbation to the attempt to drive Campbell from the church, for he said his hope was that Campbell would "be got through". At table in the home of Lord Elgin, Chalmers referred to Campbell as "rash in language," "in conduct irreproachable," "in doctrine unexceptionable."

This adds much color to the impression that there was a considerable amount of unexpressed sympathy. It does seem apparent from Chalmers' remarks that the terminology of Campbell stood in the way of more active support from those dissatisfied with the religious state of affairs. In any case, Campbell was attempting

1. Dr. Hanna's "Life of Dr. Chalmers" v.iii, 15.

to make articulate the new spirit leavening the rising generation. He was a voice crying in the wilderness in an effort to make straight the path that leads to God. He sought to make intelligible the new force which had already begun to germinate in the lives of many. Campbell's task was to provide a new understanding of the love of God in the atonement.

The Amends of Later Years.

It is not always true that the banished exile has his solitude cheered by atoning laurels. As the years passed, many expressions of regret for the church's action came from religious minds within and without the church. The time came when the church at large was far from proud of its treatment of Campbell. There was never any official Assembly action, but there were satisfying manifestations of the general feeling. After many years of hard work in an independent church in Glasgow, and of devoted service in the field of theology, Campbell was given an honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity by the University of Glasgow. It was generally recognized that this honor had special significance. Not only was it felt that the degree was a concrete evidence of the esteem in which Campbell was held, but that such approval was in itself a disavowal of the hasty action which marshalled him out of the ministry. Mr. Campbell was deeply touched by this recognition. "I feel...quite overcome by this turn of the tide of feeling in Scotland towards me and my teaching."¹

The crowning acknowledgement of Campbell's valued services

¹.Memorials, vol.II, p.208.

in advancing religious progress, came within a year of his death, and it gave to his declining days a warm glow of happiness. A committee of eminent men, among whom were John Caird, Edward Caird and Norman Macleod, along with representatives from the principal denominations of Scotland, presented Dr. Campbell with an address and a silver gilt vase with the inscription: "Presented to the Rev. John M'Leod Campbell, D.D., by a number of friends, in token of their affectionate respect for his character, and their high estimate of his labours as a theologian." Norman Macleod before making the address said that as a former Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, he could express the regret of himself and many others that Dr. Campbell was no longer in its ministry. He was sure, he said that such an event as the deposition could not occur again. Then followed the address.

"In the name of a number of clergymen and laymen, we take opportunity of your leaving Glasgow to request your acceptance of the accompanying testimonial, and at the same time to make known to you the respect and affection which we feel towards you personally, as well as our deep sense of the services you have rendered to the Christian Church.

"In thus addressing you we are assured that we only give expression to feelings widely prevalent; for, although your name has been much associated with religious controversy, we believe that all would now recognize you as one who, in his fearless adherence to that which he held to be the truth of God, has never been tempted to forget the meekness and gentleness of Christ. And, without entering upon any disputed questions, we desire for ourselves to express the conviction that your labours and example have been the means of deepening religious thought and life in our country; that your influence has been a source of strength and light to the Churches, and that in your writings, as in your words, you have ever united independence of mind with humility and reverence for divine truth, and deep spiritual insight with the purity and tenderness of Christian love.

"And our earnest prayer is, that He Who has sustained

you hitherto and enabled you to keep your heart in all meekness and sweetness of wisdom, amidst the sorest trials of patience, may be with you still, and that this imperfect but sincere expression of our esteem may cheer you with the assurance that your labours have not been in vain."¹

This beautiful tribute is a happy contrast to the heresy trial. It was a compensation for that hard experience. It was a vindication of Campbell's early faith and vision. In those days he stood firm in a confidence like that of Job. He was certain a righteous judge would deliver him from misunderstanding, and vindicate his truer view of God against that of his well meaning friends.

¹.Memorials, vol.II, p. 298.

Chapter IV.

Comparison with Luther on Faith.

The exposition of Campbell's view of faith will have associated itself in the mind of the reader, with the great Reformation champion of faith. There are striking similarities between Luther and Campbell on this subject. In one sense it might be said that Campbell has merely let Luther come forth to speak again. Campbell's sensitive spirit must have heard the muffled voice of Luther speaking through the overgrowth of religious formality accumulated through many years.

We know that Campbell knew Luther and had recognised very early the common bond of faith between them. The light which made the way plain for Luther was the same which kindled the soul of Campbell. If we set to one side the theology of Luther, and have in mind his religious experience only, we find that this experience can be viewed apart from dogma and external authority. It is, therefore, significant in comparing the two men, that the point where they are most similar, is exactly the place where the least dogma interferes with their deep religious experience. Both men discovered the essential nature of faith, and both arrived at it on that lofty meeting ground where the soul of man comes face to face with God.

In the effort to bring Luther's doctrine of faith into relief, it is hardly necessary to dwell on the legal character of the Mediaeval church. Scholasticism had littered the pathway of salvation with "fides acquisita", "fides infusa" and

"fides historica" and other religious formulae. The living spirit was blockaded by works of merit upon which man could himself climb up to heaven. The story of Luther's struggle to find peace through the manipulation of sacraments and performances of merit is familiar. This important history is not to be related here, but the significance of that struggle is all to the point in this study.

The facts connected with Luther's enlightenment have shown us the heroic figure, the towering practical genius of the reformer. Like his predecessor Paul, we see him wading out toward that legal salvation always beyond the depth of man. He too sought contentment in Pharasaism and found no rest. This vigorous protagonist wielded the same flail with which Paul¹ had separated the chaff and the wheat at Antioch. By faith Paul withstood Peter to the face because of his Jerusalem legalism. With the same essential truth, Luther defied the Pope and Rome.

Whereas Luther had previously murmured against God for His hard law and at Paul for his hard sayings, he came to find the meaning of the faith, which transcended and superseded the law, and gave him the "liberty of the Christian man". His, "Liberty of the Christian Man" is a song of jubilee. It is the exultation of a free spirit in tune with the heavens,

1. "It is not always easy for the practical expounder of Paulinism to find words that will rightly and exactly express the situation. In such perplexity, if you lay the superior stress on faith, you will not go far wrong." Sir Wm. Ramsay, The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day, pp. 179-180.

breathing the freshness of the open sky. This is what faith means to the soul of man. Here is a classic expression of the liberty whereunto Christ has set us free.

Luther never loses sight of faith and the Christ who has revealed and assured it. Luther's doctrine of faith and the atonement on which it rests, always remain the fixed centre of his thought. We have in him something new. He did not merely abridge the salvation process, he changed its very nature. For the time being we shall engage ourselves with the essential Luther.¹ It is here that we find a harmony between Luther and Campbell, for that which captivated these men was not dogma, however doctrinally described. Both saw that faith was more than doctrinal assent, mere belief. Religion is life itself. In their respective periods in religious history, faith was not primarily a confident trust, a dynamic in itself. It was belief.

Religion seems to slip all too readily from the essence of faith back to religion as law, a fact exemplified in both the Lutheran and Calvinistic branches of Protestantism. Faith had come to its own in the Reformation, but the retention of so much of the old dogma was a drag upon its progress. It prevented the development of a systematic theology from the kernel of faith and religious experience, which was the genius of

1. In a study of Luther, it is necessary to distinguish between the essential elements and the dogma which surrounds them. They are both Luther's to be sure, but without this distinction, Luther presents considerable confusion. See Herrmann's "Communion with God" p.42; Harnack "History of Dogma" vol. VII, p. 229; McGiffert "Protestant Thought Before Kant."

the Reformation. So that faith, having soared about on happy wing, was all too soon returned to a doctrinal chrysalis, securely hid by the dry wrappings which were accepted for the life itself.

But the inexhaustible vitality of truth, not content to lie buried, made a vigorous reappearance in the Nineteenth Century. The struggle in which faith was then engaged, was in many respects quite different from that of the Reformation. Luther fought for the principle that we are justified by faith alone. Campbell did not have to fight for the acceptance of this idea. That principle was unanimously admitted, but like many a slogan, the first significance had vanished. "Justification by Faith", was a venerable phrase in the church and highly esteemed; so much so, that the chief religious concern of each individual was the question as to whether or not justifying faith was his portion. And, as described in chapter one of this treatment, it led to those tests of faith which were virtually a new form of legalism. The Moderates emphasized morality as the highway of salvation, while the Evangelicals stressed belief, and neither course is exactly the way of the Cross.

Such are the anomalies of life, that what had served as a burning phrase to abjure legalism, was now the very sign under which legalism took fresh courage. Thus the Reformation faith, which could "shout for joy and also sing", had become a faith in which the joy of assurance was no necessary ingredient.

We should expect that any revival of faith, competent to bring about newness of life, would not be out of harmony with

the faith always implicit in the teaching of Jesus. So also, we expect to find parallel lines of thought wherever we deal with men of faith. We shall consider, therefore, Luther's view of faith, which has many fundamental ideas in common with Campbell. We shall also observe in what respects the two views of faith are different, and how, because of the differences, Campbell has improved upon Luther.

Luther's Doctrine of Faith.

a. The Object of Faith.

The object of faith is God, revealed incarnate in Christ, as a loving, gracious Will, in terms of Fatherhood. From Christ, we mount up to God, apprehending Him as represented to us in Christ. God is an eternal and almighty power motivated by a loving will.¹ This for Campbell is also a dominant note. This loving and forgiving will is manifested toward man in the work of Christ. Because God is favourable and gracious, He has provided for salvation by the forgiveness of sins through the work of Christ. This forgiveness is as universal as the offer of salvation, but it must be accepted and believed by faith.²

Forgiveness of sins is an important revelation which God has given of Himself. It is essential to the Kingdom of God. A condition wherein sin is not pardoned, is a state where

1. Seeberg consistently keeps this idea to the fore in his treatment of Luther, and uses it as a principle to test the ideas of Luther.

2. Commentary on Galatians p.55; Sermons, p.113. The sermons of Luther to which reference is made in the following notes are found in the volume "Sermons on the Most Interesting Doctrines of the Gospel," pub. James Duncan, London 1830, a reprint of 1581 ed.

is neither the Gospel nor the kingdom.¹ Luther like Campbell declares, "It is impossible that the conscience should be quiet and joyful unless it have peace . . . through the forgiveness of sins promised in Christ."² Forgiveness is conditional on faith, Campbell however did not thus express himself at the Row period. For Luther, "Christ is the Lamb of God that hath taken away the sins of the world. Now if the sins of the world be taken away, then is it taken away from me also who doth believe in him."³ Forgiveness lies in wait, as it were, to become actual. God will forgive.⁴

Both men hold out forgiveness as an evidence of the love of God and necessary to the life of faith. Both are able to say, "Be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee." When Luther says we must "lay hold" on this forgiveness of sins in Christ, he means very much what Campbell also means when he says that this forgiveness must be appropriated by each individual.

b. The Response of Faith.

The object of faith has taken the initiative⁵ in presenting Himself to man through the Gospels, preaching and the sacraments. The revelation should awaken a powerful response, a vital experience called faith, in which there are several elements. Faith accepts without waver the testimony of God

1. Sermons, p. 369.

2. Com. Gal. p. 45.

3. Com. Gal. p. 148.

4. Com. Gal. p. 214.

5. Campbell as well as Luther relies on God's initiative in the salvation process, thus preserving the demand of religious experience which insists that it was God who first loved us and enviromed us with His gracious advance.

presented, "embracing God in Christ with a sure faith in the Gospel that the sinner will receive whatsoever it promises."¹

Faith demands that we believe the word which Jesus hath spoken.²

"There are two kinds of believing: first a believing about God which means that I believe that what is said of God is true. This faith is rather a form of knowledge or observation than a faith. There is, secondly, believing in God, which means that I put my trust in Him, give myself up to thinking that I transact with him, and believe without any doubt that He will be and do to me according to the things said of Him. Such faith which throws itself upon God, whether in life or death, alone makes a Christian man."³ "If faith be genuine, it is a certain sure confidence of the heart and firm assent by which Christ is apprehended."⁴ Here then is a response of belief and confident trust in the revelation of God brought by Christ. The influence of this love and graciousness in God toward us should evoke love within us. There should be a more or less irresistible response, which we might call a natural⁵ or normal response, and its nature is confident trust. This faith does not make it necessary for the individual to convince himself that he is confident. If it is the right response to the revealed God, it will be a faith of confident assurance.

1. Sermons p. 225.

2. Sermons p. 336.

3. From Luther's Kurze Form or manual of prayer quoted by Harnack "History of Dogma" vol. VII, p. 185.

4. Seeberg "History of Doctrine" vol. II, p. 255; cf. Greater Catechism, Luther First Part.

5. Natural response would be a phrase more applicable to Campbell than to Luther. Luther would seem to hold that we are unable to respond unless God gives us faith. In this respect Luther would be out of harmony with Paul and according to Ramsay, Paul held to a good will present in man capable of responding to the presentation of truth.

But at the same time, a faith of this kind will be humbly bowed down with sorrow for past sin. Christ may have fulfilled the law and made satisfaction for sin, but the true sight of God begets a contrite heart nevertheless. The penitent sinner feels that he has sinned against God, and now that he actually understands the character and will of God, and how God has provided salvation for him, he is completely repentant. "Against Thee and Thee only have I sinned." The past life is shunned with disgust and shame. Contrition turns to God saying, "Create within me a clean heart Oh God, and renew a right spirit within me." This is true repentance and penitence.¹ This is the attitude of humility before God which will always be present as one phase of our communion with Him. "Our Lord and Master Jesus Christ in saying "poenitentiam agite" meant that the whole life of the faithful should be repentance."² This abolishes the Sacrament of Penance. "This word cannot be understood of sacramental penance, that is, of the confession and satisfaction which are performed under the ministry of priests."³ In penance, one of the three steps is satisfaction, which the

1. The 12th Article of the Augsburg Confession on repentance, may be true in spirit to Luther, but it does not suggest the simplicity of the matter as it is in Luther. This Article makes repentance consist of, a. contrition for sin, and b. faith conceived or generated by the Gospel. Prof. Luther A. Weigle of Yale, in his lecture on the Holman Foundation, deals with this 12th Article and makes it conform to the general understanding of Justification by Faith. Harnack finds a great deal of fault with the wording of this Article, and shows it to be out of direct line with the simple evangelical faith of Luther. "History of Dogma" vol. VII, p. 256.

2. First of the Ninety Five Theses.

3. Second of the Ninety Five Theses.

sinner makes. How contrary is this, and how impossible in the fact~~of~~ of the true repentance just described. In the faith here considered, it is incongruous to regard as possible, satisfaction made by man. Man is justified by faith. We are thus confronted by the familiar phrase, "Justification by Faith."

c. Justification by Faith.

Whenever man so forgets the nature of religion that he is enabled to take pride in his religious conduct, he becomes a self appointed hero in the ranks of God. To men who have seen God in Christ, such an attitude is extremely repulsive. The attainment of merit through works is similarly regarded as repugnant to God. To men of deep piety, any religious rite, sacrament or work designed in itself to make satisfaction for sin, is viewed in this light. This external attempt at satisfaction fosters a self-righteousness which is wholly at variance with the true condition of the sinner, and therefore unacceptable to God. Luther includes this in his meaning when he says, "My doctrine setteth forth and preacheth the grace and glory of God alone, and in the matter of salvation, it condemneth the righteousness and wisdom of all men."¹ It was through his religious experience that Luther discovered the right attitude of faith, that it is faith which justifies. The reality of that experience made him understand that it was

1. Com. Gal. p. 81.

not the "blood of bulls or of goats", nor "ten thousand rivers of oil", nor any other deed or rite which brings the divine favour upon the worshipper. He did know, that "A broken and contrite heart", God would not despise.

But this matter has deeper roots. Not only is any scheme of man-made satisfaction improper because of the inevitable self-righteousness; it is even worse in that it sets aside the importance and significance of the work of Christ. If Christ is necessary to salvation, and if he alone made satisfaction¹ for the sins of the world, without whom satisfaction could not be made, then it follows that the character of that work is modified and set aside by allowing as possible, any form of sacramental satisfaction. Where the principle of satisfaction is allowed,² there is a perversion of the sinner's proper appreciation of Christ's work, and of the right understanding of the attitude which God expects. Penance does not foster the humility which belongs to Christian character, nor does it promote

1. Campbell does not have the same content of thought in connection with Christ's "satisfaction". In this respect, as will be shown, there is a wide difference.

2. For example, this principle is strongly championed in Canon IV of Session XIV of the Council of Trent - "If any one denieth that, for the entire and perfect remission of sins, there are required three acts in the penitent, which are as it were the matter of the sacrament of Penance, to wit, contrition, confession and satisfaction, which are called the three parts of penance; or saith that there are two parts only of penance to wit, the terrors with which the conscience is smitten upon being convinced of sin, and the faith, conceived by the gospel, or by absolution, whereby one believes that his sins are forgiven through Christ; let him be anathema."

a proper consciousness of dependence upon God and thankfulness to Him for the salvation which He, and He alone has provided. The effort to win salvation by works of whatever kind, places God in the wrong light, by making God, as it were, debtor to the person who has made the satisfaction. Thus the whole spirit of the Christian gospel is perverted by cultivating an attitude contrary to the religious feeling of wholehearted gratefulness to God.

Nothing then could be more certain to Luther, as it was also to Campbell,¹ that the pursuit of good works as a means to salvation, was an un-christian enterprise. "And so it will profit nothing that the body should be adorned with sacred vestments, or dwell in holy places, or be occupied in sacred offices, or pray, fast, and abstain from certain meats, or do whatever works can be done through the body and in the body. Something widely different will be necessary for the justification and liberty of the soul, since the things I have spoken of can be done by any impious person....."²

There remained, therefore, only one open way. "One thing and one alone, is necessary for life, justification and Christian liberty; and that is the most holy word of God, the gospel of Christ, as he says, "I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live."³

1. Compare Campbell's criticism of the system of "Evidences", chapter one of this thesis.

2. "Concerning Christian Liberty", "Luther's Primary Works", Wace and Buchheim, p. 257.

3. Ibid. p. 257.

"For faith alone and the efficacious use of the word of God bring salvation....For the word of God cannot be received and honoured by any works, but by faith alone. Hence it is clear, that as the soul needs the word alone for life and justification so it is justified by faith alone, and not by any works. For if it could be justified by any other means it would have no need of the word, nor consequently of faith".¹ And when once this truth flashed upon Luther's soul, he saw it reflected throughout the New Testament. His commentaries and sermons are full of it; he sees it as the great apostolic truth.² It becomes the core of his thought. "The truth of the Gospel is, that our righteousness cometh by faith alone..."³ "Faith alone justifieth."

This faith is not measured in quantity. In order that there shall be no debate as to whether there is a sufficiency of this faith or not, faith is declared to be that which is not concerned with measure. We see that, "there is no difference with Christ between the strong and the weak in faith, for a little faith is faith also."⁴

1. Ibid. p. 258.

2. "In the whole book, therefore, of the Acts, there is nothing else handled in effect, but that it behooveth as well Jews as Gentiles, as well as unrighteous to be justified by faith and faith alone in Christ Jesus, without the law and the works thereof." From Luther's "Argument of the Book Containing the Acts of the Apostles" in the Commentary on Galatians.

3. Com. Gal. p. 99.

4 Sermons, p. 368.

"Although Peter have stronger faith than I, yet mine is as well faith in Christ as his".¹ Precisely the same truth was enunciated by Campbell² who had to combat the tendency to estimate by graduated measures how much a given amount of faith was worth.

If we ask what it is about faith which enables it to justify we get from Luther a reply made of several parts. The answer to our query has elements which we would expect to find in any diagnosis of Christian faith, but there are also elements which have been carried over from the theology of the Roman Church.³

First - Faith justifies because, as over against works, it stands alone as the attitude which God desires of man. This response of faith to the revelation of God in Christ which we have already described, is what God has intended. It is the giving to God, "the glory due unto His name." There can be nothing conceived of as nobler or more religious than man's wholehearted delight in coming under the power of the gracious will of God, and stimulated by the force of love. This makes the individual at one with the Spirit of God, and by that very fact he is justified. This oneness is present in Luther more as an effect of faith, yet it is also an element in justification.

1. Sermons p. 376.

2. See pp. 48-56 of this thesis. Compare also pp. 87-91, "The Nature of the Atonement."

3. Luther retains the idea that Christ's righteousness is actually imputed to the believer. This notion is not in harmony with the second element in justifying faith considered above.

This factor in justification is at the very heart of Campbell's teaching and is less obstructed by extraneous dogma. "In counting faith for righteousness, God recognises it as what it truly is, and therefore, that He not only in His own mind pronounces this condition of faith our right condition, but also by His Spirit utters this judgment in our own hearts."¹

Second - Faith is a regenerative power and begins to remould the nature of man. "Justification is in fact a certain regeneration into newness of life." Faith, therefore, makes a man inwardly righteous, not completely as yet, but in part. "Everyone who believes in Christ is righteous, not yet fully in reality, but in hope," for faith has begun a process, that purges from sin. Although sin remains, it is being driven out by faith, and because it is being put away, is no longer imputed. "Faith is an almighty thing and the power thereof is infinite and inestimable. . ." "That is it which maketh us divine people, and as a man would say, it is the creator of certain divinity, not in the substance of God, but in us."²

There is present then in Luther, as in Campbell, the explanation that faith justifies because it has made man righteous in the sense that the seed of righteousness is implanted within him which shall grow from more to more by the exercise of prayer and the continuance of faith. Man is justified because he has the intention and purpose of righteousness.

1. "The Nature of the Atonement" J. M'Leod Campbell p. 91.
2. Quoted from Luther by Campbell, "The Nature of the Atonement," p. 34.

The sincerity of his faith, the pure motive of his desire to walk in the spirit; this is righteousness. This is righteous will and purpose, and where there is this unmixed sincerity of desire to be conformed to the will of God, to live by faith in Him, there is righteousness. Thus faith by its very nature is righteous, and therefore by faith and faith alone is man justified.

Third - Luther advances another reason why we are justified. Whereas in the first and second elements just noted, faith would appear to be man's own response, there is in this third factor the retention by Luther of the idea that man is passive in the matter of faith. Man is justified in this case because the Holy Spirit dwells in the Christian. The Holy Spirit has taken its abode in him, not because the man himself responded to the revelation of God, but because the Holy Spirit of its own volition, by election, has entered into the man. This is not entirely consistent with Luther's practical appeal, but it is nevertheless one of his reasons in accounting for the justification of man. The human element is theoretically passive, but practically, the sinner is urged to exercise faith. In respect to passiveness arising from the election doctrine, Campbell is far removed from Luther.

Luther makes little distinction as to whether it is the Holy Spirit or Christ who dwells in the Christian. Luther sometimes expresses this doctrine of mystical union by saying that both Christ and the Holy Spirit dwell in the believer. On the whole he would join the believer with Christ. "Christ

and I must be entirely conjoined and united together, so that he may live in me and I in him".¹ The fact is that Luther uses the terms interchangeably in much the same way as they are used in the Fourth Gospel,² in describing the power that dwells in the Christian by faith.

Fourth - There is also a fourth element which is an additional explanation why the sinner is justified. Though it is not in harmony with the first two elements already discussed, and contrary to the essential character of the faith which justifies by its own inherent power, yet, it cannot be left out, for it is one of the grounds of Luther's justification of the sinner. This is the imputation of Christ's righteousness. It is essential in Luther's christology and had a long career in the theology of the atonement. Christ's whole obedience, fulfilling the law and suffering the penalty of sin, was imputed to the believer.³ Luther believes he may take to himself all of Christ's victory over sin, law, death and the devil, "even as if they were my own and I myself had done them..."⁴ "It is not without cause, therefore, that we do so often repeat and beat into your minds the forgiveness of sins and imputation of righteousness for Christ's sake."⁵ This imputation of Christ's righteousness is an important factor in explaining why it is that faith justifies.

1. Com. Gal. p. 163.

2. The Fourth Gospel" E.F.Scott.

3. A.F. Mitchell, "History of Westminster Assembly" p. 155.

4. Sermon on the Work of Christ, Luther's Sermons, p. 395.

5. Com. Gal. p. 134.

It is obvious that these reasons, now before us, all of which enter into the explanation of justification, do not make a harmonious whole. Luther left room here for disputation. And it was just variations of this sort which contributed to later theological disputes regarding justification. There came to be, not only the simple essential meaning of justification, but the question of the justification of baptized children. Justification was also used to describe the abiding state of the Christian. As we shall note, Campbell stripped faith of its unnecessary impediments.

d. Other Effects of Faith.

1. Assurance.

If faith were a mere assent to doctrine, then assurance could not be an essential accompaniment.¹ But the description of faith here dealt with, shows it to be a religious experience which is more than belief.² It avails little to merely believe in the mercy of God. In order to have the faith that trusts God and is confident in God, there must be a relation in which a deep feeling bears testimony to the reality of the truth believed in. And it is this kind of faith which gives to the believer a confidence that he has saving faith and is justified. His faith, the reality of which he feels in experience, is by the very nature of that fact a faith

1. This was the trend in the later Calvinism expressed by the Westminster Confession, where assurance does not necessarily accompany faith.

2. Seeberg makes the element of experience and feeling a common bond between Luther and Schleiermacher. "History of Doctrine" vol. II, p. 258.

which assures. Assurance goes along with faith. When faith is of this sort, then there is peace with God, for "God appeareth... altogether loving, neither feeleth the heart anything but the favour and grace of God; it standeth with a strong and bold confidence; it feareth not lest any evil cometh unto it; it being quiet from all fear of vengeance or displeasure, is merry and glad of so incomparable grace and goodness of God given unto it fully and most abundantly in Christ."¹

Luther saw the gladness which is in this faith because it knows by experience the God which is served. Faith causes, "delight in God as in a most dear and favourable father....," who gives though we deserve nothing. "Behold of such joy St. Paul speaketh, which truly where it is, there can be no place for sin or fear of death or hell, yes nothing is there by joyful, quiet and omnipresent trust in God."

These statements bear out the general view which couples Luther with the idea of assurance. Harnack speaks of this kind of faith as always the "chief matter for Luther; for only this faith secures certainty of salvation." "This expresses the ultimate and highest thing which Luther wished to say in describing the state of a Christian as a state of justification...,"²

1. Sermon "Rejoice in the Lord", Luther's "Sermons on the Most Interesting Doctrines of the Gospel"; cf. also p. 243; This idea is also prominent in "The Liberty of the Christian Man."
2. Harnack, "History of Dogma" vol. VII, p. 209; McGiffert "Protestant Thought Before Kant" p. 30.

While this is unquestionably true, for surely Luther thought of himself as a saved man, yet we should not acquire the impression from this that he who possesses faith has a guarantee that he is irrevocably saved. It is while in possession of faith that the believer has assurance. But Luther introduces, as does Campbell, the possibility of an eclipse of faith. Assurance may be dimmed by various events which cross our path. Christian faith is not a grasp which may never lose its grip. This phase of assurance and of faith is strikingly similar in both men. The necessity for perseverance in the faith runs parallel in the ideas of Luther and Campbell.

So long as faith is a present possession, it does by its nature assure the believer that he possesses that faith which is acceptable to God. He is confident of this and is, while he possesses it, a saved man. But he must continue in that faith, for faith never carries the assurance that it is impossible to fall from grace. Luther and Campbell stress the necessity of running with patience the race set before us, and persevering in all humility. Assurance will then accompany faith, but it must not falter. Luther in warning of the dangers which beset faith, cautions the individual against loudly acclaiming that he has salvation sealed up for himself; rather, "It standeth us in hand to labour that our faith may be certain and may increase and be strengthened by diligent and continual exercise of the word and fervent prayer that we may be able to withstand Satan."¹ And in a similar connection he quotes Paul,

1. Com. Gal. p. 49.

"We shall reap if we faint not."¹ "It consisteth not in the strength or slenderness of faith that we stand, but in persevering and remaining faithful."²

2. Works.

The old companionship of law and its attendant works was completely sundered by Luther, who kept them far apart. The function of the law is as schoolmaster teaching men the futility of attaining salvation by works. Instead of law and works together, we now have faith keeping a proper balance between them. Works are no less important than they ever were, but the end of work is changed and the motive is different. Work is no longer a means of salvation, but an effect. Works are religious expressions of the man who lives by faith. The faith which justifies man and which has the intention to do God's pleasure, finds its outlet in doing good. "Faith is not idle."³ A Christian bears easily his burdens and does well in conduct when his conscience is delivered from the sting of sin. What is done for the sake of salvation, is not done so well nor so joyously as that which flows from the impulse of love and gratitude.

The grace of God is an active working principle within us, and the Christian man who is, "the most free lord of all", is yet by virtue of that liberty, "the most dutiful servant of all." Herein "is the truly Christian life, here is faith really working by love, when a man applies himself with joy and love

1. Ibid. p. 516.

2. Sermons p. 366.

3. Luther's Com. on Gal. p. 250; cf. p. 134.

to the works of that freest servitude in which he serves others voluntarily and for nought, himself abundantly satisfied in the fulness of the riches of his own faith."¹

This work which faith does, is to be done in the same spirit of love which has been shown to us. In this sense, our work is an imitation of the love of God, and in this spirit it must be done. In this instance we have such an identity between Luther and Campbell, that the expressions of the one could be interchanged for those of the other. It will be observed how similar are the sayings of Luther in this respect to those of Campbell. Luther in his sermon on "Leading a Godly Life", presses home the text, "Be ye perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect." Then again, the Apostle says we are to walk in love, "whereby he signifieth that our life should be nothing else but mere love."

It is worthy of note that Luther expands the same parable of the servant which Campbell used so effectively,² and in much the same way. Though in Luther there are some crudities which do not occur in Campbell, yet the elements are in the main those which Campbell has stressed. We are to forgive our neighbour because we have been forgiven. "The Kingdom of God wherein Christ reigneth by the Gospel is nothing else but such a state of government wherein is forgiveness of sins."³ Wherefore if thou wilt have to do in His Kingdom, thou must do as he doth...."

1. "Concerning Christian Liberty", "Luther's Primary Works," p.280.
 2. Page 46 of this thesis.
 3. Luther's Sermons p. 369.

The exposition of Luther's doctrine of faith is before us. Its many similarities with the thought of Campbell have been frequently indicated. It illustrates anew that Christian faith, where it exists, has certain fundamental qualities not affected by time. On the whole, Luther diagnosed and understood well the essentials of Christian faith. There is of course, as we might expect, much that must be peeled off to get at the abiding qualities. When we do get the kernel of his thinking, we find it to be the vitality of Christian faith which has outlived the scholastic environment in which it came to light. So, too, some of the forms of Paul's thought have been passed by, but his faith is still vital. Faith lives because God lives, and faith is trust in God.

The Advancement of Campbell beyond Luther.

It would be a mistake to identify Campbell with Luther despite the striking similarity in many phases of their teaching on faith. Campbell goes beyond Luther in the matter of faith. The place of faith in the relations between man and God remain the same; so also does the essential nature of faith. Yet in Campbell, faith becomes more simple and natural, while its content is richer in quality.

We have been dealing with the essential Luther, and have referred to the necessity of distinguishing between the old and new in Luther. So that what has been dealt with, though it

may be called the essence of Luther, is certainly not the whole of Luther on faith. The context of doctrine in which faith was set, ^aeffected its quality just as a background may change the colour of the central object. It is just because Luther did not expand the discovery which came to him in his religious experience, that so much of the old was carried along. The restraint of this on the theology of the church and on Luther himself was very great. It was responsible for theological inconsistency in Luther's own mind, to say nothing of that which took place in later Lutheran theology.¹

Luther let loose religious liberty, and was a fearless champion, but he became conservative and cautious. He went so far as to suggest that faith is the acceptance of prescribed doctrine. Herrmann mentions this² and refers to the "Formula of Concordiae", where it is held that the gospel is doctrine which must be believed in order that forgiveness of sin may be obtained. Herrmann adds further, that "we must break away altogether from this idea." "We simply set aside an idea which the Reformer's doctrine concerning faith has always contradicted." This is quite true, and all the foregoing exposition of Luther is in conformity with this statement. However, the fact remains that elements creep into the presentation of Luther's ideas which we cannot set aside lightly as though they had not been. We may say that there are vestigial attachments alien

1. "Christian Ways of Salvation" G.W.Richards. Various histories of doctrine refer to the many theological adjustments which brought this condition to pass. See reference in Memorials vol. II, p. 136.

2. "Communion with God", Herrmann, p. 175.

to Luther's best thought, but at the same time, they are Luther's own. And though we like to separate that which is most congenial to modern thinking, it is only by a consideration of that which went along with it, that we gain a correct impression of Luther's content of thought.

It is actually the best in Luther which runs parallel to the more modern contribution of Campbell. But it is also possible to see an advancement in Campbell beyond that which Luther saw. We should be aware of certain angles of Luther's thinking which prevented him from attaining the clearest view of faith.

Attention has been called to the theoretical passiveness in the recipient of faith according to Luther. His doctrine of election demands such a theory, though the impulse of evangelism always tends to override the doctrine. This was also true of Calvinism. But Campbell is more consistent with man's responsibility in the matter of sin. If man is a responsible being, he must have some responsibility in the matter of faith. "The being born again is a thing which, in order that the exhortation in the passage should have any meaning at all, we must recognize as in some sense dependent on the choice and will of the creature itself." "...They might have been born again if they would, according to that word, "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." (John 5:40).¹

"Doctrines", says Campbell, "cannot prevent the heart from

1. "Fragments of Truth," J.M'Leod Campbell, p. 133.

working; and in the depths of every heart there is a conviction, stronger than any abstract reasoning, that it is unjust to punish us for what we cannot help, and that therefore God, the just Judge of all the earth, cannot do it." There has been an obstacle in the way of regeneration due to "man's mistaken conception of the way in which it is to be effected." "It is thought to be...the work of God that man is to be quite passive whilst regeneration is being wrought in him..." Campbell would think of this as a mockery of man's responsibility to choose the good. Evil, moral evil, exists because God's will is resisted by the will of men. "When I think of the practical evils that are in the world, and of all the ways in which men are calling evil good, and darkness light, - of the boast that is made of improvement and mental advancement, as if, through these, the evil that is in the world were lessened, - of the many forms of religious error which are springing up in men's vain attempts to please God in the flesh,.....; when I am compelled to come with one sweep of condemnation on the spirit in which men generally enter into all the business and all the amusements of life; I feel shut up to the certainly that from this flesh, man - each man - may separate himself if he will."¹ Unless there is a power to turn from evil, "actually given to men", Campbell could not acknowledge the righteousness of God's

1. "Fragments of Truth", p. 145. Italics are Campbell's. Lest certain parts of this quotation be interpreted as ascetic in nature, the following explanatory passages are inserted. God does not grudge us pleasure, but men "do not consider that some of our pleasures may, and do give God pain, because they are wrong pleasures." "That which is evil is self, seeking gratification in a wrong thing.." "The self-denial which God desires, is abstaining from what is evil, not merely giving up what we like."

condemnation of our sinful lives.

Campbell was also anxious to dissociate fear from faith. He wanted repentance to be free from the selfishness which fear generates. Faith would not be unspotted if the interest in "safety" played any part. Fear has its uses, but it does not belong to repentance. Luther was not so particular. He does speak of faith as our coming under the power of the love of God revealed in Christ, but this does not always take the dominant place. At one point he says, "True repentance beginneth at the fear and judgment of God." "The sinner is in despair being under fear of God's wrath."¹ Occasionally he refers to Christ as defending us under his shadow, protecting us and keeping us "safe before God from all wrath and terror of judgment."² That this was a recognized part of Luther's position on faith may be seen in the later retention of the idea in the 12th Article of the Augsburg Confession, where the contrition present in repentance, includes "terrors stricken into the conscience."

It was just this in Protestantism which caused Campbell to refer to the current views of conversion as a calling for "some covering" in the day of wrath. The presentation of the gospel in this light, created "a system by which they think to connect themselves with Christ that they may be sheltered from the wrath of God." Too frequently "this is all they think is meant by Christ being their Saviour."³

1. Luther's Com. Gal. p. 132.

2. Luther's Sermons p. 182.

3. "Fragments of Truth," p. 10 and 93.

In saying to us, "I am the way," Christ does not say to us, "I will make it safe for you, but he fixes attention on himself personally." But the "terrors" evoked by Lutheran and Calvinistic thought, had exercised a baneful effect on religious life. Campbell saw that faith could never be a worship of God in the beauty of holiness, while motives foreign to the nature of faith were taking part.¹ And this situation, he observed, was one of the very important causes of the prevalent misunderstanding of the real nature of faith. Once he caught sight of this extraneous element of fear and selfishness, Campbell banished it completely. He never vacillated in the least degree in demanding for the motive power of faith and repentance, the attractiveness of God's character drawing man to Himself by its intrinsic qualities of love and goodness.

And because Campbell did see so clearly the real nature of faith, he was prevented from pushing salvation into the future as Luther did. Luther, thinking in terms of the future said, "Wherefore all the life of a Christian after baptism is nothing else but the expectation of salvation..."² Luther made a line between this world and the next; whereas Campbell made them contiguous. "The common feeling is, that religion is one thing; life with its hopes and fears another; that we are to trust in

1. "The divines of the Reformation have not proved more able than the Schoolmen to trust the native power of faith, that devices have been had recourse to to secure that faith shall be of the right kind, which, in effect hinder the simple exercise of faith as much as the Schoolmens' demand for a faith perfected by charity...p. 340 "Nature of Atonement."

2. Luther's Sermons p. 120; cf. McGiffert, "Prot. Thought Before Kant" p. 25.

Christ for our souls, while all that relates to our concerns here belongs to a different department."¹ "The contrast is not between things present and future, but between things spiritual and carnal. It is not giving up an enjoyment in time for a greater enjoyment in eternity, but it is choosing now the joy which is in its nature eternal, in preference to the joy which is in its nature perishable..."² Salvation is a spiritual life which begins now. By regarding salvation as something to be received in the future, Luther reveals to us that his faith has not quite the same motive or naturalness that is possessed by a faith, in which the whole motive is the dynamic urge toward a Christ-like life, generated by the apprehension of the Father revealed to humanity in Jesus Christ. There is thus, in Campbell, a greater spiritual and ethical foundation in the matter of salvation.

Furthermore, because of the differences already noted, assurance has a different significance for the two men. With Luther, assurance is, as it was also for Calvin, an assurance of being saved for a future life of blessedness. For Campbell, assurance is a sure certainty that the faith which is the response of a son to his heavenly Father, desirous to live in and through the power of His love, is a right faith. And that is all we need to be concerned about. Assurance need go no further than to certify to our hearts, that our faith is that attitude alone in man which is well pleasing to God. So long as the pro-

1. "Fragments of Truth" p. 10, J. M'Leod Campbell.
 2. "Fragments of Truth" p. 138.

per filial relation with God continues, we may without anxiety commend the future of our spirits to His care.

But that which warrants us more than anything else in maintaining that the content and quality of Campbell's doctrine of faith is beyond that of Luther, rests on the great difference in their understanding of the work of Christ. Because of the wide divergence in their views as to the character of the work of Christ in the atonement, there is a consequent effect on the outlook of faith; a difference in apprehending the object of faith. Faith is enhanced in quality proportionately as the ground of that faith is enriched. Here we find Campbell going far beyond Luther and the Reformation. We have here a wide difference in outlook, and Campbell was aware of this. Campbell criticized Luther's view of the atonement, but he was unable to criticize it without first rendering homage to Luther, whom he rightly exalts.

Surely no one has paid higher tribute to the work of Luther or has had a better conception of the calibre and worth of his work. Campbell entered into the nature of Luther's thinking with fullest sympathy. He understood Luther better than most men of his time. Few knew Luther so well, for most men by virtue of their theological furnishings, were precluded from realizing so fully the significance of his work. Campbell regards Luther with warmer feelings than he does Calvin, and laments the general lack of appreciation of his achievements. We do not have to strain Campbell's eulogy of Luther to gain

the impression that he regards Luther's services as the greatest Christian contribution since Paul.¹

Campbell refers to Luther's "deep insight", "his vivid realization of the grace wherein we stand being redeemed; his true appreciation of the glory which God has in our faith; his discernment of the relation in which the peace and confidence towards God which are present in faith, stand to the perfection of the revelation of the Father in the Son; the personal interest in Christ which he recognized as possessed by all men and revealed to faith in the gospel; and the importance which he attaches to an appropriating response on our part." For all this Campbell expresses appreciation, but he goes on to say as to the "nature of the atonement, I have admitted that Luther does not offer much help towards a clear intellectual apprehension of it."² But, such is Campbell's generosity as well as regard for Luther, that he is willing to concede the possibility of Luther having contemplated spiritual realities which he is unable to express, though his language has "not without cause given offense." His language may have had meanings which the words do not convey, but if he is "interpreted according to the plain grammatical meaning, the words by which he expressed Christ's relation to our sins cannot be true."³

1. "No man excepting Paul has seemed to me to attain so much to the pure, simple, spiritual confidence of faith as Martin Luther". from "Memorials," vol. I, p.136; see also Appendix no. 2 in "The Nature of the Atonement."

2. "Nature of the Atonement," p. 41.

3. Ibid. p. 42. There is a strange irony in this remark for it is a charge which has been made against Campbell's own expressions on the Atonement.

Campbell of course objected to the two prominent features of Luther's doctrine of the atonement: first, the literal identification of Christ with all human sin and his actual punishment therefore; second, the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the believer. Objection is also made to the language used. What Campbell has in mind in objecting to Luther's language is illustrated by the following passage. Christ has for us become, "...the greatest transgressor, adulterer, thief, rebel and blasphemer that ever was or could be in all the world." "For he being made a sacrifice for the sin of the whole world is not now an innocent person and without sin, is not now the Son of God born of the Virgin Mary, but a sinner who hath and carrieth the sin of Paul, who was a blasphemer, an oppressor and a persecutor; of Peter who denied Christ; of David who was an adulterer, a murderer...and briefly who hath and beareth all the sins of all men in his body; not that he himself committed them, but that he received them being committed or done by us and laid them upon his own body that he might make satisfaction for them with his own blood..."¹ "He pays and makes good for our debt so that we are released from it." "He is a sacrifice and payment for the sin of the world." Luther constantly expresses the work of Christ in these terms,

1. Luther's Commentary on Galatians, pp. 253-254.

and to Campbell such satisfaction¹ is far from the character of the atonement. This to him is "legal fiction."

In the matter of imputation, Campbell has no point of contact with Luther. To Luther, this is one of the causes for the recognition of the believer as justified, and it does much to mar the simplicity and naturalness of those other elements in justification held in common with Campbell. To make justification depend, in any degree on the actual punishment of Christ for our sin, and then our receiving by imputation his righteousness, is at best a strange and unnatural transaction. It is not surprising that Campbell found little aid in Luther toward an "intellectual apprehension" of the nature of the atonement.

1. Herrmann "Communion with God" p. 109 is idealizing Luther when he says the word "satisfaction" does not represent Luther correctly. In support of this, he quotes from a sermon of 1543 Erlangen Ed. XI: 306: "The whole Papacy has had no better idea what to teach concerning Repentance than that it consists of three parts, which they call Regret, Confession and Satisfaction, and they are unable to teach the people aright concerning any one of these. And indeed as to the word 'satisfaction', we have been willing to please them and let it pass (in the hope that by gentleness we might bring them to the true doctrine); yet on the understanding that it means not our giving satisfaction but Christ's, e.g. that He pays for our sins and conciliates God by his own blood and death. But since we have so often experienced hitherto, and still plainly see that we cannot win them at all by any gentleness, and that the longer they live the more they will contradict the true doctrine, so we must strip ourselves clean of them, and part from them, and have nothing more to do with the words they have invented in their schools, with which they now only seek to confirm their old error and lies. Therefore, for our part, shall this word satisfaction continue no longer, and it shall be dead in our churches and our theology, and it shall be handed over to the judges and schools of the law, where it belongs, and whence also the Papists took it." Herrmann concludes from this that Luther clearly declares, "that a satisfaction rendered to God for the purpose of restoring His grace to the sinner does not in the least concern the communion of man with God;.....that Luther had admitted it into consideration in the doctrine of the atonement out of friendly regard for the then prevailing mode of thought, but that he had in view its entire repudiation.

For after all, the conception of Christ's work as satisfaction, in the meaning Luther ascribed to it, merely transfers legality from the mundane sphere into that beyond. Man is not to attempt to make satisfaction, for Christ has made it already. The believer is saved for heaven, not on his own satisfaction to be sure, but because of the legal punishment of another. The confidence in the Cross is thus, as Campbell stated it, "confidence merely in a work performed." "Their own works they regard as worthless, His as excellent; and they think they have God's authority for transferring their trust from their own works to Christ's."¹

But it seems to us that the quotation will warrant a different interpretation. Luther wants to be rid of the word satisfaction it would seem, because of the harm which has come from it in the matter of repentance. He has only "let it pass", though always "on the understanding that it means, not our giving satisfaction, but Christ's, e.g. "that He pays for our sins and conciliates God by His own blood and death." The quotation would appear to be right in line with the interpretation of Luther set forth in this thesis. Herrmann has a footnote on p. 109 of "Communion with God" from H. Schultz's "Doctrine of the Deity of Christ", in which the opposite conclusion from that of Herrmann is maintained. However, it does not convince Herrmann. It is to be noted that Harnack, however, "History of Dogma" vol. VII, p. 218, understands Luther's doing away with satisfaction as relevant to the question of repentance only. It would seem to us that the only modification which might be made as to the word satisfaction, is that suggested by Seeberg, "History of Doctrine" vol. II p. 267, note two where he contrasts Anselm's "Satisfaction" and Luther's "Satisfaction." "In Anselm, satisfaction is brought to God personally as to an offended private man; according to Luther, it consists in the fulfilling of the divinely given system of laws by our representative Christ. Since satisfaction is rendered to this moral order of the world, and it is thus recognised and actually honoured, the wrath of God is appeased and the law made powerless."

1. "Fragments of Truth" p. 161.

This conception stands in the way of an adequate comprehension of God because of its distorted view of Christ. "Our trust in Christ is to be, not in the works he did, but in the spirit which gave those works their character."¹

By freeing justification from all such imputations² as here considered, Campbell has contributed a new and valuable chapter toward the understanding of faith. It is a "misty confused perception" of Christ as a way of salvation, "that has led good men to maintain the doctrine of Christ's imputed righteousness; a doctrine which is so fatal in its tendency on the minds of those who rest in it as a substitute for personal holiness."³ It was a keener appreciation of the nature of the unfolding love in the atonement which enabled Campbell to interpret faith in simpler and more natural terms. There are fewer obstructions in the course of the explanation which makes clear the love of God.

Campbell had a clearer perception of that purpose behind the work of Christ which desired man to inherit at once the life and relation of sonship. He saw what Luther did not so well appreciate, e.g. the actual filial relation of love between God and man, and the simplicity of Christ's witness to that fact.

1. Ibid. p. 161.

3. Ibid p. 102.

2. We are aware that J.K.Mozley, "The Doctrine of the Atonement" p. 191 says, "Similarly, he (Campbell) sympathises with the idea of imputation, though not with its intellectual expression, as testifying to the sense of dependence on Christ." We would maintain that this conveys a wrong impression of Campbell. The above quotations even from an early work, show that he is not sympathetic to the idea of imputation. This is further brought out in the chapter on the atonement. The page to which Mozley makes reference, number 139 of "The Nature of the Atonement"

In Campbell we do not find the entanglements of "legal fiction" which encumbered Luther's vision of faith.

"I have an entire and sorrowful conviction that there is still very little distinct realization of what our Lord means, when he says, 'I am the way.' Men's thoughts are full of what he has done for them, and they look for the puttings forth of almighty power to save them, and leave out of account that which is indeed the essence of salvation, Christ himself, the way and the truth and the life. I desire to fix your thoughts on what he is, as constituting the great interest of what he has done and will do for us, and to urge you in your own personal experience to make proof of this path of life."¹

We tend to imply that, "God must be changed rather than ourselves; that there was no distance but that of legal exclusion, and no return but from judicial banishment into personal favour." "But our Lord's words direct our attention not merely to some power put forth on our behalf by him; they direct our attention to what he is as in itself salvation: - 'I am the way,' so fixing our attention on a condition of the human heart and spirit manifested in himself, in which our spirit must be found in order to be near unto God."²

(6th ed.), indicates that the "vague feeling of the standing which the human spirit needs to find in another than itself," makes Campbell more sympathetic to those who cherish such a sense of dependence, however wrongly conceived, than to those who attempt to stand in "independent self-righteousness before God." But it is a mistake to infer from this, that Campbell for himself is sympathetic to the idea of imputation. In fact, Campbell is not sympathetic to the idea of imputation in any form as an explanation of the atonement. One hope behind this exposition of Campbell, is the desire to vindicate a magnificent conception of the atonement from the mistaken associations which surround it. Cf. Robert Mackintosh "Historic Theories of the Atonement" p. 133-134 where he declares Campbell to have caused quantitative understandings of the Atonement to disappear.

1. "Fragments of Truth", p. 95.
2. Ibid. p. 97.

Because of the higher conception of the relation between God and men, revealed by Christ, in whose footprints men are to place their feet, Campbell attained a closer and truer impression of the object of faith. He was more in the line of vision, while Luther was to some extent out of focus. The mirror reflected less darkly for Campbell. This will appear with even greater clearness in his theory of the nature of the atonement.

Surely where the object of faith is more perfectly seen, the response of faith will be truer to its ideal form than will that faith whose object is more heavily veiled. There is this difference between Luther and Campbell. Campbell did see the glory of God in the face of Christ in a brighter light than did Luther. In consequence, the quality of that faith which the teaching of Campbell brings into view, shines clearer than that of the illustrious Reformer whom Campbell so highly esteemed.

Chapter V.

Antecedents to the Study of the Atonement.

1. The Intellectual Approach to the Atonement.

Campbell thinks he sees in religion certain facts that must be taken into consideration, and which philosophy alone or even theism alone may pass by. There is sometimes a tendency to lose the highest meaning of God from a contemplation of the universe as governed by law. That there is a reign of law, Campbell has no doubt. Only on such a determinate and fixed order is science possible. Yet, we need not lose God in a universe of law nor identify Him with it in a spiritual pantheism. We ought to go beyond law for "its highest and purest interest is that which belongs to it as a form which the will of God has taken in ordering this fair universe, and in respect of which it is to faith a revelation of God." If in the contemplation of the universe and its science, "we stop short of God," we "do violence to a deep instinct of our being."¹

We are constrained by this tendency of our thought to trace all the laws and powers which we see acting together, to one Will as the source of their existence. But, "here we come to a point

¹.cf. Hume. If as we believe, Philo represents Hume in Hume's "Dialogues concerning Natural Religion," we have him saying the following: "And if the infidelity of Galen, even when these natural sciences were still imperfect could not withstand such striking appearances (of a creator), to what pitch of pertinacious obstinacy must a philosopher in this age have attained who can now doubt of a supreme intelligence." p.167 of ed. with Introd. by Bruce M'Ewen Edin. 1907.

at which our own experience no longer accompanies us as light." However, "if we freely yield ourselves to the necessary relations of thought....we cannot lose the being of God in the reign of law", for we should be able to rise from science to theism.

At the stage of theism many are satisfied to rest content. Campbell understood well the attitude of many intelligent and educated minds which feel satisfied with theism as fulfilling their religious requirements. "These seem to themselves to have come as near God as they are warranted in doing, when from a distance they admire and adore Him as He is revealed to their faith in His works; holding the due expression of reverence on their part to be the grateful use of this universe which He has made..." They often feel that any "personal approach to God, any seeking communion with Him, still more any exercise of trust toward Him for a putting forth of His power in response to such trust, i.e. anything strictly in the nature of prayer, as an unwarranted stepping out of man's proper place." "This stopping short in theism, not rising to religion has always had much charm for philosophic minds."

In the gospels Campbell finds a demand which calls for something more than a mere theistic viewpoint. Religion, if it is anything, is participation in a religious relation. It causes us to rise "from the faith of God as God, to the faith of God as the Father of our spirits." The gospels would seem to anticipate or contemplate for man a nearer approach to God than that made possible through the faith in His power seen in nature about us.

Campbell would set religion in a sphere of its own, not because religion is incompatible with science or philosophy, to

both of which he was keenly alive, but because it is different and has its own conditions. "In passing from theism to religion, or rather in adding religion to theism, we are changing a contemplative position in God's universe for the active occupation of our own special place as God's offspring." So that it is not intended to disconnect religion from all contact with philosophic inquiry or with science; on the contrary the effort is made to establish their right relation. Religion is regarded as active participation with the God which theism contemplates. Religion is a welcoming of privileges and acceptance of responsibilities, "in the faith of the feelings with which God is regarding us," and "in the apprehension of the response to these feelings which is due from us." That is, Campbell would say, we place our faith in this God whom, because we acknowledge Him as the Father of our spirits, we believe to have the feelings of love toward us, and in the power of that faith we welcome the privileges which such a relation demands, as well as delight in the responsibilities it brings. While doing so, we apprehend a response in ourselves which carries a conviction of its reality. Religion is the "welcoming of a life in communion with God,a life, the lights and shadows of which, the joys and sorrows of which have exclusive reference to the aspect of our God towards us; the aspect towards us of ~~that~~ divine love which, while as love it is unchanging, yet must because of its very nature, ever change in the look with which it regards us according to our changing selves."¹ To such a life the Gospel calls us, and we shall have to examine the claim

1.p.xxv, The Nature of the Atonement, J. M'Leod Campbell.

which Christ in the gospels makes upon us.

If religion has the right to make a claim upon us, what is its relation to the ordered universe in which we find ourselves? "Here then are two regions of the divine self-manifestation to which we are related; the one the reign of law as seen in the light of theism; the other the Kingdom of God proclaimed in the gospel and the light of which is the Son revealing the Father." Our practical obligations to both spheres, it is held, cannot be contradictory. They are, however, distinct, "and it is important that we discern clearly their distinctness."

In both spheres, "we have to do with fixed and determinate laws." The difference between these regions lies in this, that in our relation to the material world of science, we have to do with "a system of things to which God has given existence;" while in our religious relation, "we have to do directly with the will of God; His mind and character, that of which we say that God is love." "To know the system of things to which we find ourselves a part and to conform ourselves to it, is practical wisdom in relation to the reign of law. To know the mind of God and conform ourselves to it, is practical wisdom in our relation to the Kingdom of God."

Campbell is of the opinion that the distinction here made is of great importance. On the one hand, we have a manifestation of the will of God in the more or less fixed form of natural law, the constitution of the world around us. But there is also the will of God as divine mind and character which we must apprehend in order to understand our own place in the scheme of things. It is only from that side of what God is as love, that we can ever learn

what God wills us to be as moral and spiritual beings. If God is a God of love, He must have a choice for us which, in the nature of the case, He would desire us also to choose for ourselves.

It is the confident belief that the gospels reveal this side of God to us, with all that is required to make possible our participation in it. Through Christ in the gospels, we observe God speaking to us in authority though in love, expecting in return an obedient though loving response. We see it taking the form of fatherhood on God's side, and a response in the spirit of sonship on our side. And this is all the deeply personal side of religious life which science or theism alone cannot reveal. They help us intellectually, but they cannot give us the revelation which the gospels unfold, and which calls for our active response in a religious relation. For to Campbell, we are in a very deep sense God's offspring, God's children. It was not, therefore, difficult for him to believe that God's love toward us would take a more intimate and personal form of action or revelation in coming near to us, than is the case where we see God's power manifested only in the realm of material laws. The filial relation announced and revealed by Christ would appear to be, on due consideration, just that point at which God has made an intimate personal approach to mankind.

However, the manifestation of this relation has been revealed by divine love in a certain way. We might propose to set out with the axiom that God is love, and think we could deduce from it creation, incarnation and the ultimate participation of individual men in the divine nature. The history of thought, however, is against us. "We could not have anticipated the course of the

divine self-manifestation." But God has given us the capacity of recognizing His glory in the manifestations He has given. We are here face to face with revelation. We are to take the divine facts as they have been given to us. We are not to "substitute our own deductions for the facts of the gospel." "It is natural and right to ascend from the facts of historical Christianity to the principles and laws of the Kingdom of God which these facts make known to us."¹

The consciousness which comes through religious experience demands the kind of separation which has been made here between the realm of what is purely the material of science, and that area which is the proper field of religion. If religion, as Campbell has shown, is not in a sphere apart, then we could not have prayer. The demarcation which has been set before us enables us to "see a place of free action occupied by God as the Father of our spirits", and also "a liberty in relation to Him conceded to us as His offspring." This permits "direct personal dealing on His part and on ours; so that we are free to ask from God what, in the light of His will we see to be good; and He is free to grant with simple and direct reference to us in response to our trust that which we ask." There is a sphere which is faith's own. Campbell very splendidly says, that "place which the fixedness of law, as what we may always assume, has in our practical relation to the reign of law," is filled "in the Kingdom of God by the character of God." We may always depend upon the character

1. Much of what Campbell regarded as Biblical fact we do not regard as fact today, but he maintained a true centre which was the fact of Christ Himself and what Christ reveals to spiritual open-mindedness.

of God in the religious relationship, just as we can always assume the fixity of law in the material sphere.¹

There has come down to us a certain conception of God as Father and of a relation to Him which is sonship, which is presented to us in Christ. Is this a reality? "As we look on him who has come to us in the Father's name, hear his words, trace his path, do we find ourselves in a position to accept his claim...?" "In so high a matter, the warrant for faith must be as high as the demand for faith." If it is true that God is teaching us that He has given to us eternal life and that this life is in His son, we have here the highest and ultimate claim which God revealed in Christ has on our faith. Although a great many errors and systems have veiled the face of Christ in the past centuries, yet Campbell believes it is possible to get at the enduring features of Christ's testimony. We are sure that we see a testimony to divine fatherhood and divine sonship, and God's intention to have us share in the divine sonship. Is this a conception which commands faith?

Campbell would argue that if such a conception when properly understood, does not evoke faith, there is little likelihood of anything else doing so. It was certainly the evangelical method of the Master in his approach to men. "He constantly assumed that his commending of the Father ought to have a response in their spirits." He expected that their consciences would respond. Christ assumed the reasonableness of his message, and declared it was only hardness of heart which refused to let it shine in upon them. If the Christian message; if the apprehension of God in

1. "The Nature of the Atonement" p.xxviii; cf. D.C. Macintosh, "Theology as an Empirical Science", p.140 ff.

Christ does not find a sympathetic chord within us, what can? If that light which men behold when seeing Christ does not awaken a response, then nothing can. "No other course is compatible with the assumption that men ought to know God, and trust God as a Father." There must be that in man which can respond because of the very nature of his humanity. If the obligation on man for faith is valid, then that demand must coincide with the possibility of a basis for that faith in every man. And, "If we rightly consider the record of Christ's personal ministry, we shall see him ever taking his hearers to a light already given in the spirit and in every man; to which light it is that he appeals in claiming to be received because coming to them in the Father's name." There is such a thing as an enlightened conscience, and Campbell claims that the internal evidence of Christianity must find its sanction here.

The atonement, which we may at present carry along in our thought as the whole work of Christ, has a distinct and definite function in our personal relation to God as the Father of our spirits. It is here that the atonement belongs, for it was due to a disordered relation between ourselves and God that need for the atonement arose. "To bring that relation into harmony with its divine ideal, is the end which it has contemplated." "The reign of law as such, offers no place for an atonement, even as it offers no place for prayer." The atonement, therefore, belongs in what is properly the sphere of religion. And, it is in the atonement that Campbell sees that approach of God to man wherein He comes nearer, as it were, manifesting Himself in more personal terms than was possible in the domain of nature and its fixed laws.

The atonement thus becomes the via media between God and man. It is in Christ, who is the channel of our reconciliation, that divinity and humanity meet. The mighty power of the universe is mediated to us in Christ, in the atonement, as a personal Being. Even more, He is the Father of our spirits desiring to establish filial relations.

We have in this way passed into the realm of Christian faith, which, however, is not divorced from a considerable amount of Christian fact historical and personal, upon which faith from time to time does find it necessary to rest the sole of its foot. And Campbell desires Christian facts to be taken into consideration. Yet there is that in Christ which is presented to our faith purely as such, which is intended to call forth responses in us like sympathetic tones. There is no validity or religious obligation unless the human soul is an instrument capable of responding to the music of the Spirit. It is only in the realm of faith that we can meet God if ever we are to meet Him at all. If the human spirit is not thus created, then if there is a spiritual touch, it must strike upon it as on a clod or as upon the beasts of the field. But Christian experience claims the reality of the relation, and Campbell from the depths of an enlightened Christian consciousness will unfold for us what has been revealed to his faith by the life and death of Christ.

Campbell desired, in so far as possible, to enter into his subject free from all schemes of theology. He attempted to fathom the meaning of the Christian relation by gaining an adequate appreciation and understanding of Christ Himself. "I have kept within the limits of self-evidencing light." The intention is to

set down nothing as having taken place in the life of Christ which cannot be shown to have taken place. He is perfectly conscious of his purpose to interpret terms such as "propitiation" and "sacrifice for sin", in the light of what the life of Christ itself reveals.¹

The atonement can be appreciated best from the side of faith, accompanied, however, by enlightened reason and judgment. It may be true that "without faith it is impossible to please Him," yet at the same time God asks of us only a "reasonable service." The divine mind in Christ is presented to our faith in the gospels as human while divine. On that account it must be intended that we as human shall be able to understand it. We must strive for an intellectual apprehension of the atonement that "our intellectual nature may be met," but we would fail in our search here if our spirits were out of tune. "That which is spiritual must be spiritually discerned." It is not intended to bring the atonement down, but rather to raise the understanding to that which is in a sense above it, and to the exercise of thought on that which is spiritual. It is a region in which we feel ourselves "brought near to what is divine and infinite and made partakers in the knowledge of the love which passeth knowledge."

With reference to man, Campbell has no difficulty in accepting the proposition that man needs to be born again. The facts of life are plain to him that men cannot just "rise on stepping stones of their dead selves to higher things." Men cannot pull themselves up simply by their own strength. Mankind needs to be

1. Introd. p. xvii.

redeemed and born anew. And that alone which can save men from sin is a new quality of life, the eternal abiding kind of life at work in Christ. If this eternal life which is offered to us and received by us in Christian experience is the "same" "divine life in humanity in which Christ made atonement for our sins, then the connection between the atonement and our participation in the life of Christ is not arbitrary but natural." By becoming Christian we actually become "partakers of the divine nature," and there is a spiritual fellowship and union which is a reality in the spiritual sphere into which we have now been born. Being born again is more than a metaphor; it was a spiritual fact for Campbell as it is spiritual fact for all true disciples. The manner of our entering into the fellowship of Christ will appear as we proceed.

2. Criticism of Calvinism.

As has already been suggested, Campbell has been impelled to rear his whole point of view, his whole philosophy of life, on the observed elements of the life of Christ. Campbell was a careful student of philosophy, yet his faith in ideal spiritual ends was grounded in his understanding of the life of Christ. Philosophic ideals and realm of ends had special reference to the life of Christ for him, and had meaning only in the light of that great divine fact.

Campbell has no quarrel with philosophy, for he believes philosophy has often done much service to religion, nor can he understand how a philosophical mind can, "without submitting to

fetters which..... are not of God, be contented to hold a religion which is not to it also a philosophy, and the highest philosophy." But the channel of the highest philosophy is to him the Christian experience, which holds forth the highest apprehension of God which we know. The kind of Christian experience which the Fourth Gospel holds out to view, would be for Campbell the only adequate training for a divine philosophy. Campbell would have no objection to the investigation of various unsolved philosophical problems per se, which, like the poor, are always with us, but we need some stabilized outlook and he would base this on a philosophy of the Christian faith. We arrive at it by "following the footsteps of Jesus, listening to his words, seeing his deeds!" Our whole view of life must grow, if we have had a walk with Christ, out of our contact with him, rather than through speculation about divine attributes. And what is true as to reasoning regarding divine attributes, is applicable to philosophy in general.

The man of Christian faith, the man who prays and finds a warrant for his faith in his own intimate experience, does use that faith as a criterion for philosophic as well as theological conclusions. For example, a philosophical absolute in which the individual's conscious experience is but a swiftly passing moment is not only unpalatable but incongruous to the Christian man. Similarly Christian faith will not accept what an enlightened Christian conscience denies, e.g. arbitrary acts of God's favour as in Calvinistic election.

On this principle Campbell was dissatisfied with any theology or philosophy of life which ran counter to the demands of Christian

faith. He would begin with the historic Jesus. His process of thought moved, not from apriori premises to particulars, but from what he would call divine facts to the laws of the Kingdom of God. It was felt by Campbell, that Owen and Edwards and other Calvinists were trying to comprehend and include the recorded work of Christ in their systems, in the light of their reasonings about God and His attributes, "rather than that reasoning engaged in after the due study of the life of Christ." "It has been said that Calvinism is a philosophy in its essence, and I do not object to it on that account, but because it is not to me a true philosophy." Theology was still pre-Kantian and similar in its method to that of the days of Wolff, when the whole body of theology was deduced from a rational conception of God as perfect Being. Calvinistic theology too, was a deduction from what we now think was a distorted conception of God's sovereignty. Campbell broke off all connection with such theology.

In the light of the atonement in which Campbell stood, he was in a position to make some of the most incisive criticisms of the Calvinistic view of the atonement that have ever appeared.¹ Calvinism is open to the serious objection that it does not enable us to conceive to ourselves what the punishment is which the elect were bound to undergo, nor how Christ can have endured the punishment so conceived. Edwards, in Campbell's opinion, saw the presence of a real problem here, and made some attempt to conceive of the nature of Christ's suffering. * Though he failed and used the language of "legal fiction", yet "when he comes to explain

1. Chaps. III, IV, V, "The Nature of the Atonement."

the facts of Christ's actual experience, as they were conceived of by him, he says nothing that implied, either that God looked on Christ in wrath, or that Christ felt as if he did." There is room for a dispute with Campbell over this statement, nevertheless Campbell does recognize that Edwards was unable to find an explanation which satisfies either ethical or intellectual demands. Occasionally Edwards came near the border of new conceptions and it is Campbell's regret that Edwards was unable to cross over.¹

Owen, a great Calvinist, at one time stated that, "to affirm Christ to die for all men, is the readiest way to prove that he died for no man in the sense Christians have hitherto understood." This is precisely the issue with Campbell, for Protestant theology was working with an idea of the atonement that was unacceptable for several fundamental reasons which can be stated very briefly. He would reason that, "That cannot be the true conception of the nature of the atonement which implies that Christ died for an election from among men." His support of this contention is the later fruitage of those germinal ideas of the Row days, which until now had been fructifying in a well-nurtured soil.

It cannot be gainsaid that a limitation of the atonement detracts from the universal character of Christianity. As the discussion of the Row doctrines has already brought out, such limitation takes away the universal warrant for every man to say, "This gospel is given to me personally." A gospel that is not universal, and free from the cajolery which would make it so, has

1.cf. Stevens, "The Christian Doctrine of Salvation" p.425. "For myself I can form no idea of substitution which appears to me at all tenable, except that which Edwards defines as substitution by 'strong sympathy.'"

no universal claim on man.

Furthermore, it is none the less true that the limitation of the atonement, and the whole manner in which such an atonement is defined, cannot be a revelation of God, "no longer a work revealing that God is love," for says Campbell, "an arbitrary act cannot reveal character." "An act of which he that performs it gives us no other account than that he wills it because he wills it, can never by any light in it, make the character of him whose act it is known to us." The non-elect have been "passed over arbitrarily, or at the least on no principle of choice that can be made known to us, or at all events, that is made known to us — This makes the work of Christ as presented to the faith of human beings, strictly an arbitrary act." "To say that God does not authorize us to expect an explanation of the reasons of His acting — that He gives not account of His matters, is not to the point. Be it so. But if it be so, it does not the less follow that what He has done has left us ignorant of Himself; that so far as the acting of which He gives us no account is concerned, He is to us the unknown God."¹ We cannot judge God's character by what He has done for the elect and accept this as an evidence of love. What about His action toward the non-elect? Both are God's actions; by which of the two are we to judge Him? This is a cul de sac which is inescapable.

Campbell, however, is ready enough to confess that men are often much better than their views. Men may be incapable of seeing the flaws in their ideas, but their conduct may be full of

merit despite them. The holders of Calvinism are thus regarded. There is a "contradiction allowed to exist between the faith of the head and the love of the heart, and in spite of their theology the men who love God much because much is forgiven them, love men also," and therefore labor zealously to bring others into the fellowship of that love which their actions declare to be universal. Campbell speaks of Edwards, Brainerd and others saying, "How marvellous it appears that such reasoners did not give to their understandings the help that they might have found in their own spiritual consciousness, and make, so to speak, an axiom of the love to man that was in their hearts, and reason from it..."

Another cogent remark relative to the Calvinistic atonement, is Campbell's observation that it is a "substitution of a legal standing for a filial standing as the gift of God to men in Christ. The atonement is intended to bring us into a relation of sonship, and not as enabling us to stand like criminals whose penalty is paid. We are to have a filial confidence in approaching God, not a legal confidence. Too much attention has been fixed upon the obedience of Christ unto death as the fulfilling of a law, and leaving out of view the life of sonship in which the fulfilling of law has taken place.

When Campbell refers to the fulfilling of the law in this way, he is desirous of changing the old centre of interest. We are not to think of Christ's life in terms of a fulfillment of law in which, by some unaccountable process, we share. The centre of interest should be Christ's life as a demonstration of sonship in humanity, which because it is ideal sonship, does by its very nature fulfill the highest ideal of law. The object of Christ's

coming into the world was not to fulfill the law simply as such, but to reveal the Father and the life of sonship in humanity. We are not to think of Christ as coming merely "to literally fulfill the law," but to redeem us by the spiritual power of love from sin, "that we might receive the adoption of sons." Such a life would of itself in its whole expression, fulfill with perfect naturalness the requirements of the highest ethical ideal.

The law to Campbell, in its purest expression, is a very high and worthy ideal. When he speaks of Christ honoring and fulfilling the law, he does not have in mind the Pharasaic fringes with which men busied themselves at the expense of weightier matters. What Campbell thinks of as law, is that summary of the law which in Mark 12:29-31 is formulated by Christ Himself in answer to the question of the scribe, "What commandment is first of all?"....."Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and mind and soul and strength." "The second is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." Campbell takes Christ's utterance as a statement of the very essence of the law. To Campbell, it is as though Christ said to men, "This is the way in which men should have thought of the law." He believes he finds in this an epitome of the spirit of the Hebrew religion. Here was the core which had been covered over by anise and cummin and what not. Without the help of Biblical criticism, is not Campbell here trying to express what we have in mind when we say that the prophets had the substance of the matter, while the priestly element spun out the minutiae of the law? What we have been able to see as the ideal of the prophets, and which has been summed up in the statement of the Master, is that which Campbell understands to be

the law which Christ honoured and fulfilled. This he did naturally and spontaneously and not with studied step. So that, in other words, what we think of even now as the highest ideal to be attained, e.g. loving God with all the heart and mind and soul and strength, and neighbour as self, is what Campbell thinks of as the law, or more strictly, the ideal of the Kingdom of God. This ideal, Christ in humanity did fulfill and honour.

This end is understood as always having been the essence of the law of the Kingdom of God, but which has been imperfectly realized hitherto. It will be realized in us only as we begin to live the life of sonship. The "virtue and power that are in sonship" have already been demonstrated by Christ, who is the ideal representative of humanity. The law as now conceived is fulfilled in ideal humanity, but ideal humanity is ideal sonship. Only in "the life of sonship" are we fully able to honour this law, for only as sons are we possessing the power which enables us to will and to do of God's good pleasure. Only then will "the righteousness of the law be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit."

In view of this explanation, it would be entirely erroneous to consider Campbell's references to the fulfilling of the law as meaning Christ's literally filling the legal measure which men had failed to fill. Christ lived the ideal before men in the strength and power of the filial relation. Mankind is to be ~~lift-~~
~~sed~~ toward ideal attainments under the power of the same force or life of the spirit. Man is to be saved, not by his ability to fill the cup of ideal accomplishment which he cannot do here, nor by having it filled for him by the merit of Christ, but only

by having within, the power of the endless life, the life of filial oneness with God. The law which Campbell has in mind is the Christian ideal, but its path is not trod by legal steps of self direction, but through a life of oneness with God revealed by Christ, and into which he has led the way.

Over against a Calvinistic substitution, or any kind of substitution, Campbell finds it a worthier conception to think of Christ's work as of infinite excellence performed in humanity; an excellence creative of a similar excellence in men themselves. "Surely to bestow on us in Christ the life that has taken outward form in that work, is at once a much more natural and a far higher result of that work", than a conception of the atonement wherein man is sheltered rather than raised to oneness of mind with the Father. The bestowal on us of a divine quality of life like unto that which was complete in Christ, is a view which pays a finer tribute to what Christ is and did, while it is also a nobler conception of the gift that is given to us in Christ.

Even the modified Calvinists did not grasp the real meaning of the atonement. Instead of seeing mankind as sharers in the divine nature, they saw man as sharing only in the benefits which the sacrifice of Christ accrued for them. The modified Calvinists recognized the inability of the older Calvinists to explain adequately how the righteousness of Christ could be transferred to the sinner. They came to see that it was not possible to regard the righteousness of Christ as transferable. However, in place of this insoluble problem they introduced another, e.g. the declaration that the effects of Christ's righteousness are transferable. Campbell shows that it is no easier to conceive of this than the

other, and that it is equally artificial.

/ Campbell's real dissatisfaction with such views is, that they did not see the intention in the atonement to make man righteous. Schemes of theology related man's salvation to the merit that was in the work of Christ. This interest in theological accountancy was just as unprofitable as the legality which Christ criticized. / Unless man is led by the life and death of Christ into righteousness of mind and heart into fellowship with the Father, which of itself is acceptable to God and which alone can justify man, / then the atonement is robbed of its meaning for Campbell. The idea of a transfer to us of righteousness or the benefits of righteousness is an artificial conception at best. There are of course, Campbell would say, benefits which come to us because of Christ, but "it would be far from correct to speak of these as 'effects of righteousness transferred', or of their bestowal upon us as a treating us as if we were righteous." "Is there place for anything so outward as this in the matter of justification? Surely a justification which does not introduce us into the light of the divine countenance is no justification at all."¹

"The faith that apprehends the gift of eternal life, is eternal life commenced. The faith that apprehends the gift of the Son utters itself in the cry, Abba, Father. Therefore, in the deepest sense, the Son of God has left us an example that we should walk in His steps. In the highest path that our spirits are called to tread, that is to say, in our intercourse with the Father of spirits, the footprints of Jesus are to guide us; our confidence is to be the fellowship of His confidence; our worship, the fellowship of His worship: for sonship is that² worship, in spirit and in truth, which the Father seeketh."

Men were thinking too much in terms of justice seeking

1. "The Nature of the Atonement," p. 83.

2. Ibid. p. 91.

'punishment. Aside from the fact that Christ could not bear it for us, there is the further important fact that justice has been improperly understood. There is certainly in the conception of justice, the element which assents to the need for the sinner to suffer in some form, but justice if it is really justice, does not see the sinner only as a fit subject of punishment. It sees him "as existing in a moral condition of unrighteousness." Justice would desire unrighteousness to cease and become righteous. In this way the justice which abides in God craves for righteousness in man with a yearning which the righteousness in man alone can satisfy. "Surely the divine righteousness desires to see me righteous; the divine holiness desires to see me holy - my continuing unrighteous and unholy is as grieving to God's righteousness and holiness as my misery through sin is to His pity and love."

"All experimental knowledge of God would become impossible" where any theory of the atonement is held, "which does not accord with our being able to walk in the footsteps of the son in his intercourse with the Father."
 "A true conception of the work of Christ must be in perfect harmony with the nature of that eternal life - the life of sonship - which is given to us in Christ... The sacrifice for sin by which the worshippers are sanctified must accord with the nature of the worship; that worship which is the response of the Spirit of the Son to the Father....."¹

The palpable shortcomings of the existing ideas of the work of Christ made Campbell desirous to press forward to a "fuller apprehension of the great work of God in Christ, which will render it to us a full orb'd revelation of God, and a manifestation of the heart of the eternal Father." He expects the view to be developed, to connect itself naturally with our justification and

1. "Nature of the Atonement" pp. 92-93.

sanctification, and to all that pertains to our participation in the eternal life of sonship.

3. Character of the Book, "The Nature of the Atonement."

It has been said that Kant constructed the "Critique of Pure Reason" with scissors and paste. He did give his reader much cause for complaint, but he struggled with a difficult chain of reasoning. His pen did not run smoothly for his thoughts were like newly quarried rocks, jagged and uneven. In a similar manner Campbell wrought, and he gathered together many great thoughts some polished, others rough and unhewn. This great theologian like the great philosopher, has been misunderstood and misinterpreted, but in both there continues to be a body of thought value unimpaired by later thinking.

There are other striking parallels between Kant and Campbell, such as the use of old words in new connections and with entirely different meanings, but the comparison is sufficient to indicate the difficulty encountered in interpreting Campbell's "The Nature of the Atonement". Most writers in this field call attention to the recondite character of the book. Aside from the new twist given to familiar words like "confession", "repentance" and "expiation", the style itself is very difficult to follow. Sentences of more than two hundred words are not infrequent, while those of one hundred words are abundant. It is an arduous task to follow Campbell through the devious windings of dependent clauses and qualifying phrases.

In spite of his own manner of writing, Campbell was aware of

the value of a good style and the pleasure which it gives to the reader. After reading some of Froude's writings, he expressed his appreciation of the splendid style and the delight it would give him to be able to write in the same lucid manner. But on reflection, Campbell thought that if Froude had to expound what he strove to explain, Froude's style would have been less readable. There is some warrant for a statement of this kind. The man who has seen a vision, finds difficulty in painting it with the limitations of language. Campbell did see a great light and he tried his best to portray its radiance, but the new colors were elusive, and to us they are not likely to be apparent at the first glance.

Mr. Macmillan, the publisher and friend of Campbell, was very keen of mind, and at once recognized the inherent difficulties of the book. Though he highly valued the unique contribution of "The Nature of the Atonement" and expected it to attain a high repute and exert great influence, he nevertheless realized that it was "too serious and too deep to have a large circle of readers." He thought it would require "on the part of readers a combination of seriousness and intelligence that would be found in comparatively few." Campbell then consoled himself with the hope; "if I am made helpful to these few, it will be well, and through them it will reach to others...."¹ The remarks of Mr. Macmillan recalled to Campbell the words of his aged father, who whenever his son wrote a paper for him, would say, "...I am quite satisfied; but your way of saying it is peculiar. You have your own way of

¹ "Memorials" vol. I, p. 267.

writing; Fecit suo more."

Campbell's method of writing his book does not commend itself to us. He did rewrite the whole of it and recast it more than once, but he did not determine the chapter divisions until he was finished. In consequence, the end of a chapter is no guarantee that much valuable material to the subject in hand, will not be found in the next or some other chapter. Furthermore, the topical divisions have not always been happily phrased. Particularly is this true in the very important chapters six and seven. Reference is made to "Christ's dealing with God on behalf of men", and this has suggested in the past, a greater objectivity in Christ's relation to God than is actually present. The intention is to make clear the mediatorial character of Christ's work, but the divisions in these chapters make it easy to infer the presence of an artificial arrangement in the atonement theory which is not at all there.¹ The fact is, that this "dealing with God on behalf of man", is just as much "a witnessing for the Father to men", as is any other phase of Christ's revelation.

Then again, Campbell's argument does not always adequately sustain the particular principle he wishes to explain. The principle itself will be excellent, but the argument for it is not always convincing. It is as though at times, he sees great truths by flashes of intuition, and in spite of the fact that he sees the truth and understands its implications perfectly, he sometimes finds it difficult to secure the necessary reinforcements to carry his point.

1. Dr. Denney found fault with Campbell for this apparent artificiality. So also Dr. James Orr.

That such a book could run into six editions, with three reprints of the last edition, and still be widely read, is a great tribute to its intrinsic qualities. Men continue to find spiritual truth buried in its pages. And the book has lived, not only despite its too frequent clumsiness of expression and vagueness of meaning, but in the very face of criticism by theological writers which would have settled the fate of any ordinary volume. Mention has already been made of the unfortunate allusions and inaccuracies in church histories, but in specifically theological writings dealing with the atonement, Campbell has been, in our opinion, invariably misunderstood.

The Customary Classification of the Theory.

There has come to be a more or less general agreement as to what Campbell's theory does involve. Only one man, however, has gone so far as to say, "The theory has been treated by critics of all schools as the eccentricity of a devout author, who, dissatisfied with the traditional theory, has substituted in its place another, involving not only great difficulty, but even something very like absurdity."¹ This is "the unkindest cut of all", for as a matter of fact, most writers on the subject have treated Campbell with the greatest respect. Yet the general opinion conceives Campbell's theory in a very definite way as a treatment which, "For the doctrine of vicarious punishment, however expressed....substitutes a doctrine of vicarious repentance

1. A. B. Bruce, "The Humiliation of Christ" (Cunningham Lectures) p. 318

and confession."¹ So that, "Such representations, so far as we can understand them, would seem to imply on the part of the Redeemer, a self-imputation of the sins of fallen men, to even a greater extent than the advocates of His vicarious substitution in the room of sinners would contend for."²

It is very easy to understand how readily such views of Campbell could arise. These delineations of the theory do at times suggest themselves from the pages of the book, for Campbell has, here and there, poured new wine into old bottles. The criticisms which occur in books and in some of the earlier reviews, are similar to the present writer's own first reactions. And yet, all the while there was the constant feeling that the real truth of the matter still lay hidden. Repeated reading made more sure the clinging conviction that the current understanding of Campbell is incorrect. And herein lies the charm which this book has exercised and which still causes it to be read despite all that has been said against it. "The Nature of the Atonement" fastens itself upon the mind. There is so much more in it than those disputed passages which men customarily regard as the vital essence of the theory.

Moberly seems also to have come under the spell. Though he too runs into the same obstacle which has been the stumbling block in Campbell's theory to so many; viz, "Christ's confession of our sins", he nevertheless allows for a different interpreta-

1.J.K.Mozley, "The Doctrine of the Atonement," p.193; so also G.B.Stevens, "Christian Doctrine of Salvation," p.213.

2.Thomas J.Crawford, "The Scripture Doctrine of the Atonement," 4th ed., p. 332.

tion of the term. "The phrase, we may say, at once does very imperfect justice to the real thought of Dr. M'Leod Campbell."

"He quite certainly means by it much more than the words suggest."

We feel sure that this is the case, and that the meaning is different from its supposed meaning.

There is also another instance of critical comment, tempered, however, by the suggestion that the theory may have a connotation not immediately evident. Robert Mackintosh in a reference to Campbell says, "In any case, he can hardly mean precisely what he says." "In the present connection, Campbell's language, as distinguished from his thought, seems to exaggerate his affinities with orthodoxy."² And similarly we find Bushnell asking "Is it clear when Mr. Campbell speaks of repentance in this manner that he means any such thing as we commonly understand by the word?"³

Apropos of this matter, it is important to note that Campbell himself met criticism with a denial that his view must be understood as vicarious repentance. A critic⁴ asks, "Is vicarious contrition at all more conceivable than vicarious retribution?" Campbell, in referring to this article, made a reply to it which occurs in the appendix of all editions after the first. "Had I represented what Christ felt and confessed to the Father as a substitute for repentance in us..." in the same way "as Christ has been represented as bearing the punishment of our sins as a sub-

1.R.C.Moberly,"Atonement and Personality", p. 405. Moberly's so-called improvements on Campbell's theory only detract from that view which Moberly thought was Campbell's.

2.Robert Mackintosh,"Historic Theories of Atonement," p. 270.

3."Forgiveness and Law," Horace Bushnell, p.31.

4."National Review" for April 1856.

stitute to save us from punishment, the reviewer's question would have been apposite, and a fatal objection to my whole conception of the atonement." "But this is not my teaching; and all that I have represented as the atonement remains untouched by the question."¹

There is a growing impression that Campbell's views have not been duly recognized, and there is reason to believe that he is only now beginning to come into his own.² And when we consider along with this Campbell's own statement running directly counter to the customary characterization of his theory, suggesting that, whatever else the theory is, it is not what it has been declared to be, there is, it would appear, a place for fresh investigation.

In referring to Campbell, Professor Wm. Adams Brown has said: "Campbell's critics have objected that in substituting for the older doctrine of vicarious punishment his newer teaching concerning vicarious repentance, he has simply replaced one difficulty by another. They argue that the conception of vicarious repentance is no easier to hold than that of vicarious punishment; indeed it is less easy, since repentance as a personal act of the individual is strictly untransferable, whereas punishment being inflicted by another, may conceivably be visited upon a substitute. Such a criticism, however, does not touch Campbell's main contention. He

1. "The Nature of the Atonement," p. 341.

2. There has been much recent interest in M'Leod Campbell in theological circles through the reading of papers. See also articles in The Expositor by Dr. J. H. Leckie, which are very appreciative of Campbell, Expositor, Jan. & Feb. 1921, May 1923; also article by Wm. Adams Brown, "Expiation and Atonement" (Christian), Encyclopedia of Religion & Ethics; H. R. Mackintosh, "Some Aspect of Christian Belief" pp. 94-98.

is not concerned primarily with the problem how the benefit of Christ's repentance can be transferred to others, but rather with questions, what condition must be fulfilled if man is to be forgiven at all. This he maintains to be repentance pure and simple, and in this contention he has been followed by not a few leading writers on the doctrine who differ from him at other points."¹

There is one other writer, who entered into Campbell's thought and followed a line of interpretation similar to that which this monograph sets forth. C. E. Pritchard is the writer in question.² He wrote an article on "Modern Theories of the Atonement" in the North British Review for June 1867, and there discussed "The Nature of the Atonement."³ His space is limited and he is, therefore, unable to go at length into his exposition, but on the whole, in so far as it is developed, its salient features are very similar to much of the present treatise. We shall occasionally call attention to the similarity in footnotes. The important fact in connection with this book review, is Campbell's satisfaction with it. He regarded the comments of Mr. Pritchard as showing a greater understanding of the argument of the book than those in any of the earlier reviews.⁴ Mr. Pritchard's appreciation of Campbell's meaning, resulted in his expressing

1. Ency. Rel. & Ethics, "Expiation and Atonement" (Christian).

2. Our knowledge of Mr. Pritchard is limited to a footnote in "Memorials" vol II p.190, quoted from Principal Shairp of St. Andrews: "Constantine Pritchard was Fellow and Tutor of Balliol, afterwards rector of Luffenham, Rutlandshire. He was at once one of the most thoughtful, truthful and religious men I have ever known though the world has heard little of him."

3. The writer of this thesis did not read this article until after his own interpretation had been completely written.

4. Memorials, vol. II, p.128; also p.248.

that appreciation by letter and in person.

In view of the present new approach to the subject, the interpretation here undertaken will be enforced in so far as possible with Campbell's own words. But quotations apart from an interpretative context are inadequate to convey the real thought of their author. This is exactly the difficulty encountered in Moberly's treatment of Campbell.¹ Several pages of quotations serve only to leave the reader more or less bewildered, and perhaps a little dissatisfied with the mode of expression. The "Nature of the Atonement" needs interpretation, but the present attempt will, wherever possible, utilize Campbell's language.

Many parts of the volume under discussion are plainly readable, and there is much in it that is magnificently expressed. The style is sometimes in the finest vein, and through the whole of the book there is a spiritual atmosphere, deep and profound. The sections which have usually been quoted most, are the very ones which are most difficult. Familiarity with the manner of writing enables one to enter into the sweep of its thought. There is here, we believe, a theory of the atonement which can satisfy our best ethical demands and most of our religious requirements.

There is sufficient reason for this assertion. Campbell does not recognize the work of Christ as a transaction which changed God's attitude towards men into a love which was not there before his appearance, nor as a work by which Christ bore our punishment or guilt by substitution, nor as a vicarious repentance,

1. This is equally true of J. Dick Fleming's treatment. (Dr. Fleming also misreads Campbell when he refers to the theory as a form of "legal satisfaction"] "Redemption" p.164, Hodder & Stoughton 1921.

which is the ground of our forgiveness. In no degree whatsoever did Christ accomplish a righteousness which is to be imputed to us. On the contrary, Campbell sees in Christ a revelation of the eternal God, always reaching out toward the children of men seeking to lead them to Himself. In Christ he sees what divine love suffers because the children of the Father are sunk in wayward paths of sin. Campbell thinks of this revelation as intended to raise mankind to an understanding of what its sin means to God, and to reveal to the spirits of men the love of God toward them. This revelation aimed to reproduce sonship in us by inducing genuine repentance and sorrow for sin, while directing our aimless feet into new paths of life, reproducing in us Christ's spirit of love. We believe, therefore, that in this theory there is conveyed to us spiritual affirmations which belong to the highest Christian consciousness.

Chapter VI.

The Theory of the Atonement.

1. The Ends Contemplated in the Atonement.

There are two general ends contemplated in the atonement. There is a twofold aspect which the love of God had in view in bringing salvation to man; one retrospective, referring to the evil from which that grace brings deliverance; the other prospective, referring to the good which it bestows.

In a sense this division is arbitrary, for it would be impossible to have the one without the other. It would be admitted, however, that this is really one fulfillment of the divine purpose, but in order to emboss on our minds an adequate appreciation of the atonement, the division has been resorted to. The use of this twofold distinction is also intended to expose one of the shortcomings of traditional theology, e.g. the emphasis on saving man while tending to minimize the significance of sonship for this present life.

The retrospective or negative aspect of the atonement keeps before our minds the fact of evil and sin to which flesh is heir. It would be unpardonable to create the impression that Campbell views sin lightly. The love of God has been emphasized, but behind it is always the hope that the apprehension of the character of God will reveal to us the depth of human sin. Sin is the great fact in human lives which stands

opposed, in so many complex ways, to the will of God. It is true that the religious conscience does have a deep sense of sin, and does have also a keen sense of its dependence upon the free grace of God. But even the unconverted person can find warrant in his own conscience for the existence of sin. Campbell, therefore, "cannot qualify the assertion that the testimony of Scripture as to the reality and guilt of sin, and the sinner's dependence upon free grace for pardon, has a clear and unequivocal response in conscience". Men have a varied and sad experience of the evil in their lives, while also they do experience longings after some good. We have these lights and shadows, but we need a deeper explanation; something to explain our darker experiences while at the same time directing "our aimless longings to the unknown hope which was for us in God". That light which can reveal the evil of our condition as sinners as well as the good of which God saw the capacity still within us, we find in the atonement.

If men do not actually, like Paul, see in some degree a warfare going on within them; if they do not observe an "inward contradiction" between the law of their own well-being and self between the true ideal of excellence for humanity and the clutch of sin; then they are not prepared to appreciate the atonement "Until a man has come to stand at this point, he is not fully prepared to consider the atonement retrospectively, that is, in its relation to the evil condition from which it is our deliverance".¹

It is as though the atonement were a bridge over a great cleft in a rock. By standing upon it, we look back and see the evil of our lives as we never saw it before, and then by virtue of this atonement, we walk over into a new life with God, which but for the atonement, would have been unknown to us. The atonement enables us to see our sin as God sees it, and to see the glorious capacity for good as God sees it, while it is to us the way from the one to the other.

The prospective or positive side of the atonement has to do with the gift of eternal life, and "eternal life may be apprehended by us as a manner of existence - a kind of life..." The excellence of this life when portrayed to us cannot do other than commend itself to our best thought. "I speak of eternal life - that life which was with the Father before the world was, and is manifested in His Son". It is understood to be a life "lived in humanity". "I do not speak of an unknown future blessedness in a future state of being, of which conscience can understand nothing, but I speak of a life which in itself is one and the same here and hereafter - however it may be developed in us hereafter beyond its development here". 1

It is possible for conscience to take cognisance of this life. If we see it in Christ and compare it with the elements of the shadowy sinful side of our lives, it is certainly possible for conscience to decide which is the more excellent.

Having done so, conscience is able to see the great grace of God in bestowing it; this life of salvation. This is particularly true because we are dealing, not with a future life, but with this one. "Ordinary religion is so much a struggle to secure an unknown future happiness, instead of being the meditation on and the welcoming of the present gift of eternal life". When it is said that the gospel must commend itself to every man's conscience in the sight of God, Campbell would assent and would maintain that conscience is perfectly capable for the task. Conscience is able to assent and admit that this life of eternity which begins now, this new quality of life, is excellent beyond anything else conceivable. It is this eternal life to which our hopes have been raised by Christ. If our consciences will carry us this far, we are prepared, says Campbell, to understand the prospective side of the atonement, which brings to us a life of sonship in the Kingdom of God.

We now have before us the extreme opposites of life. On the one hand, spiritual darkness, death, sin, inward disorder and strife between man and the law of his own well being, together with the righteous condemnation of God upon sin. The atonement is intended as a deliverance from this; it is the retrospective side of the atonement. On the other hand, the possibility of divine light filling humanity, eternal life partaken in, righteousness and holiness and an inward harmony experienced in the fulfilment in man of that idea for him which was in the divine mind from the beginning. This is the prospective side of the atonement.

When we think of God as looking upon man and recognizing these two opposed conditions, i.e. "the evil state into which sin has brought him, and the opposite good state of which the capacity has remained in him", we are constrained to think of God as desiring "to bridge over the gulf that separates these two conceived conditions of humanity". If there is a way by which God can accomplish this; if the good which we have conceived is a possible good for man, we must think that God, "will put it within man's reach". We cannot but believe that though we have sinned, God regards us with a love which has survived our sins. While beholding us in our sin and knowing the capacity for sonship within us; surely seeing this, He must desire to bridge the gulf between them by providing the means for man to go from one to the other if it is possible.

This loving attitude of God which has survived our sins, must not be considered as arising out of an atonement. Rather we should find it more reasonable to believe that this love of God toward us would provide an atonement; a way out of our sin toward the ideal good; a way which leads to an at-one-ness with God. This atonement or way of the Cross must be seen as the result of the forgiving attitude in God, not its cause. The forgiveness which we conceive as being in the heart of God should be viewed as the responsible cause which made possible an atonement, the bridge from evil into good. The atonement will be the form which the forgiving love of God takes toward man.

Such a view will preclude, says Campbell, any ideas of the

atonement which "represent God as needing to be propitiated to be made gracious". "An atonement to make God gracious, to move Him to compassion, to turn his heart toward those from whom sin had alienated his love, it would indeed be difficult to believe in.." "If it were needed, it would be impossible", for if God by His nature is not a loving Father, regarding us already with a love surviving our sins, then an atonement could not make him such. To awaken to the need for that kind of an atonement, "would certainly be to awaken to absolute despair". But, "the Scriptures do not speak of such an atonement, for they do not represent the love of God to man as the effect, and the atonement of Christ as the cause, but just the contrary, they represent the love of God as the cause and the atonement as the effect." What we are asked to consider by the gospel, is that which will commend itself to our consciences as, "the way in which the forgiving love of God has manifested itself for the salvation of sinful men." 1.

We need not be surprised, Campbell would argue, to find that our reconciliation with God could not come about without suffering. That way which could bring man from evil to the good must come at a great cost. Men have often objected to the "necessity" for suffering. Why should not the pardon of sin and divine clemency be simply intimated? Why should not this new and great gift of sonship which God has in store for man be bestowed and presented to men as the rich bounty of God without suffering? These objections are very easy to make.

It does seem easier to think of God as capable of giving us salvation by an act of will putting forth power guided by wisdom. This seems easy for faith. But it is not so easy for us to believe that there may be an object desirable to God's love, which, however, cannot be accomplished by a mere act of divine will. The desired object in this case, we grow to understand, must come some other way, by a "process which implies a great cost to God and self-sacrifice.¹ The revelation of God could come only by suffering. Unless that is present, we fail to reach the fullest understanding of the nature of God. Without suffering, the work of Christ would lack something; it would not show us God as He is. Merely to have God revealed as a great benefactor does not satisfy. It is just those elements of suffering which "give to the atonement its power to be that peace and hope for man which the gospel contemplates, and which a simple intimation of the divine clemency and goodness could not quicken in him." "It is that God is contemplated as manifesting clemency and goodness at a great cost, and not by a simple act of will that costs nothing, that gives the atonement its great power over the heart of man." The internal evidence of love gives to it its power, so that the strongest attractive force of Christianity is, that it represents God as manifesting self-sacrificing love, and shows the reality and depth of love as creation or providence could not do.

1. Page 21.

2. The Sufferings of Christ for Man.

If we are Christian at all, we can agree, apart from any type of theology, that Christ came to show us the Father in order that we might have life in abundance. We may, therefore, start out at this point. Christ has been given, "for a witness to the people"; "to witness for the excellence of that will of God against which we were rebelling, to witness for the trustworthiness of that Father's heart in which we were refusing to put confidence, to witness for the unchanging character of that love in which there was hope for us".¹ This witness bearing was accomplished by his personal perfection in humanity, in a perfect revelation of what love is and does. Therefore, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father".

We see God in Christ because in him we see the will of God made manifest. "The will of God which the Son of God came to do and did, this was the essence and substance of the atonement".² In the attempt both to understand and to explain adequately the essential nature of the work of Christ, Campbell takes the text "Lo I come to do Thy will O God" (Hebrews 10;7) as the golden thread which runs through the whole of that life. Let this be, "the great key-word on the subject of the atonement". Coupled with it is the fortieth Psalm, which uniquely fits the spirit here expressed. "I delight to do thy will, O my God; Yea thy law is within my heart. I have preached righteousness in the great congregation. Lo I have not refrained my lips, O Lord thou knowest". It is striking that a great modern scholar has

1. Page 111.
2. " 106.

used this same New Testament text, together with the fortieth Psalm, to express his own lofty thought of what Christ's life stands for.¹

The will of God spoken of here is that will which immediately connects itself in our thoughts with what God is, that will, the nature and character of which we express when we say, God is holy, true, just, love. We are not to think of this will as the synonym for a plan of redemption; Christ's purpose was not merely an intent to fulfil a plan. Christ desired to fulfil and show forth the will, the mind of God in humanity.

In seeking to discover the will of God in Christ and Christ's doing of this will, we shall be helped "if we remember the relation of the second commandment to the first as being like it² that is to say, the spirit of sonship in which consists the perfect fulfillment of the first commandment, is one with the spirit of brother-hood which is the fulfillment of the second". In other words, Christ, we observe, not only loved God with all his heart and mind and soul and strength, but he

1..T.R. Glover, "Jesus in the Experience of Men", pp.66-70; Stevens in "Christian Doctrine of Salvation" p.372 lays stress on the Epistle to the Hebrews. This epistle always had a prominent place in Campbell's thought, and for much the same reason that Stevens advances for himself; "In no other writing of The New Testament is stronger emphasis placed upon the imitation of Christ than in this Epistle; Christ has lived the pattern life we must repeat his experience".

2.We need to recall that Campbell has in mind the summary of the law; "Love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and mind and soul and strength and (2nd) thy neighbour as self". See Pages 157-158, thesis.

loved his brethren as himself. "He the perfect elder brother, unlike the elder brother in the parable, sympathized in all the yearnings of the Father's heart for his prodigal brethren; and the love which in the Father desired to be able to say of each of them, "My son was dead and is alive again; he was lost and is found", in Christ equally desired to be able to say, 'My brother was dead and is alive again, he was lost and is found'"¹ This was the will of God in Christ illustrating the purpose of Christ, as the writer of Hebrews conceives it, "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God".

This witness bearing of the Master was burdened with suffering from first to last, which made his whole life a sacrifice. As a witness, as a manifestation of God, Christ suffered throughout the whole of his ministry. There was a constant train of painful experiences in being repudiated by the very people to whom he brought his truth. He witnessed a perfect witness of the Father before men, but men put themselves at enmity with him; they hardened their hearts against him. The very love which he presented was spurned, so much so that we think of him as saying, "reproach hath broken my heart". Here was burden and sacrifice.

Though we know that Christ had also the inward joy and peace of oneness with the Father, of which he was also a witness nevertheless, the element of sorrow is a great element in his witnessing for God. For surely, "If God should appear as a man on this sinful earth, how could it be but as a man of sorrows?" And Christ revealed this God of grief to us. The unremitting

1. "The Nature of the Atonement". p.108.

unremitting pressure of our sin and misery upon Christ because of the mind of God within him, because of his oneness with the Father, made him necessarily, a "man of sorrows". "Look and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow". We see here eternal love coming face to face with the enmity of carnal mind. Men were capable of rebuffing that love. How real then must have been his suffering, and how real also the fact of sin. How ~~much~~ man needed to be redeemed when he could so readily crucify the good.

We need to bear in mind from the outset that the suffering of Christ here conceived is in no sense, "an endurance in time of infinite penal sufferings, sufferings commensurate with the eternal sufferings which were the doom of sin...", nor is any place given to the idea that Christ's person gives such infinite value to a substitutionary suffering that it is potential for all if not actually drawn on by all. There is in this theory no, "weighing in scales of the sufferings of the Son of God" in any form. "The truth is that the sufferings of Christ arose naturally out of what he was, and the relation in which he stood to those for whom he suffered..." Campbell has no sympathy with any view which is interested to find a proportion between Christ's sufferings and sin, in the legal sense. He does express himself at one point as though this might be his idea, when he refers to the "real and necessary proportion that was between our sin and that wounding to which Christ submitted in making his soul an offering for sin".¹

1. Page 249.

This statement is no doubt what Mozley has in mind when he says of Campbell, "Nor does he hesitate to conceive of a proportion between men's sins and Christ's sufferings, for these are 'essential to the living reality of a moral and spiritual atonement'"¹ However, Campbell has earlier in the book indicated the manner in which he uses the term proportion. In developing the view that Christ could do no other than suffer, because there was present in him holy love regarding sin in the light of that love, he says, "If the sinfulness of sin and the misery to which it exposed sinners were painful to him because of his holiness and love, then must they have been painful in proportion to his holiness and love."² A conception of this kind we cannot criticize, for it must be present in any high and ennobling interpretation of Christ's suffering.

In considering the suffering of Christ, we are not to fix our attention on the suffering simply as suffering. Campbell is surprised to notice that in the past, the atoning element in the suffering has been, "the suffering as suffering," and "the pain and agony as pain and agony". Somehow, strangely enough, it was not seen that the holiness and love which takes the form of suffering, naturally, because of what it is in itself, is that in which atoning virtue lies, for only our fellowship in that suffering can purge our lives of sin.

1. J.K.Mozley, "The Doctrine of the Atonement", p. 191.

2. P.99; cf.also pp.249-250 where Campbell speaks of Christ's sufferings as in the nature of the case proportional to his spiritual perfection.

Campbell objected to the ~~crude~~ contemplation of the physical suffering not only in Protestantism, but in the Roman Church. "It recalls to me what I felt on the Continent in seeing the real feeling manifested in a worship which seemed fed and sustained by the vivid realization of Christ's sufferings as physical pain, and which recalled the words, "knowing Christ after the Flesh". There does not seem any limit to the emotional religion that may thus be cultivated, which yet may be devoid of spiritual apprehensions of Christ, of what His sufferings for our sins really were, or what his love sought to obtain for us through them, even fellowship in His own mind His ~~own~~ divine life". 1.

It had not been sufficiently seen that this holiness and love, in seeing sin as it was and man's condition in reference to that sin, could do no other than suffer. We are not to isolate the suffering as suffering. Not that, but what Campbell desires to burn into our minds is the great truth that, "The sufferer suffers what he suffers, just through seeing sin and sinners with God's eyes, and feeling in reference to them with God's heart". 2 That kind of suffering is a sacrifice which has, as Campbell develops the spiritual meaning of it, a power which alone is that which can make atonement for sin.

The very fact that Christ came as he did to do the will of God, made it unavoidable that the burden of our sins should lay heavy upon him. And in this sense he is a sacrifice for our sins. He sacrificed everything to the one end that we might be saved through him. By coming in the likeness of sinful flesh, he is "related to us while by love identified with

1. A Letter to his Son. Mem. Vol II p. 144.

2. p. 101.

us, " and thus, "necessarily he came under all our burdens, and especially our great burden sin." There is more here than a mere passive feeling of depression over our sin. Christ by "living the life of love in humanity, must needs care for all humanity, for all partaking in humanity even as for himself; so being affected by the evil of the life of self, and enmity in humanity according to his own consciousness of the life of love, and at once condemning that life of self, desiring its destruction", he felt "himself by love devoted to the work of delivering man from it at whatever cost to himself." ¹ The Master, therefore, moved by the force of love, we conceive of as the Saviour, "taking upon him all our burden, undertaking our cause to do and suffer all that was implied in obtaining for us redemption." It is divine love in humanity acting, "according to its own nature, and must needs bear our burden and work and suffer for our salvation, and this in ways which we who are human can understand, and shall understand in the measure in which the life of love becomes our life." ²

The kind of suffering which we have just been considering as present in Christ, is a manifestation in humanity of what our sins are to God. What a far higher vindication of the divine name and of the character of God now seen in the divine longsuffering love manifested to us by Christ, than is that suffering conceived of as a punishment inflicted by God.

1. Page 109.
2. " 109-110.

Through the manifestation in humanity of what our sins are to God, we have witnessed a suffering which is ever present in the divine mind until men are made at one with God. This work of Christ is truly a great mediatorial work. And further, we are not to suppose that the suffering here contemplated is that which the divine has merely been content to suffer for us, not that, but "that suffering is the suffering of divine love suffering from our sins according to its own nature; a suffering therefore, in relation to which the sufferer could say, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.'" 1.

3. One Form in Which Suffering Love Communes With God.

We have now reached, in some respects, the most difficult part of our interpretation, for we are to deal with that section of "The Nature of the Atonement", which has usually been accepted as the keystone of the theory. The various attempts to understand Campbell, have customarily taken their cue from the second division of the sixth chapter, and have on that account been, to our mind, misled. This part, of all the book, is most suitable for misunderstanding. It is thought that here if anywhere, is that which alone can be truly called an atonement, while the fact is, the theory is only half here, and as Campbell himself says, it is not the more important of the two. Almost invariably this partial statement of Campbell's view is

accepted as the theory itself; while because of that very fact, the critic is precluded from correctly estimating that portion. It is here that men tend to find an objectivity which makes them in the end classify the position as a form of "legal satisfaction". Before launching out into the discussion, it may be further pointed out that Campbell hurries on to his next chapter in his eagerness to show his fuller thought, lest too much be assumed by the reader. Just as chapter five is essentially a part of the sixth chapter, so the seventh chapter and many other parts of the book are necessary to throw light on it also. It is only in the light of what follows that we can properly estimate these pages. Even the communion with the Father, which we are now about to discuss, is only in part, as the heading shows. The complement which makes it one whole is given in the fifth section of this present thesis chapter. Unless we make the attempt which this paragraph suggests, we are as Campbell himself says, "under a disadvantage" in seeing that which he would commend to us.¹

The communion of Christ with the Father will be the outpouring of suffering love as it unbosoms itself in prayer to God. Christ knows that there is a divine wrath against sin, so Campbell takes the phrases, "appeasing divine wrath", and "expiating the guilt of sin", and relates them to Christ with a new

1. Mr. Pritchard in the North British Review, June 1867, recognized the necessity for taking the "prospective" material into account for the understanding of the first part.

content. This word expiation in particular, has a significance quite apart from its traditional connections. Whatever in these expressions is in accord with truth, "for there is some truth in them, though mingled with error", will be discovered by eliminating that which is false. "The wrath of God against sin is a reality, however men have erred in their thoughts as to how that wrath was to be appeased." ¹ "Nor is the idea that satisfaction was due to divine justice a delusion, however far men have wandered from the true conception of what would meet its righteous demand." ² We are now to see how Christ, "in dealing with God on behalf of men", dealt with the righteous wrath of God against sin, and accorded to it that which was due

The oneness of mind with the Father which we saw in Christ; this Will of the Father in Christ, witnessed to man the divine nature suffering for sin. Thus it is possible to say that divine love took a form which condemned sin. That which in its hold on human life caused divine suffering, must be in itself exceedingly repulsive and worthy of condemnation. There is thus, obviously, a righteous condemnation or wrath against sin. Christ was in full and perfect sympathy with God's condemnation of it. In his communion with God he confessed to the sin and

1. P. 116.

2. Dr. Fleming objects to the retention of the idea that God must be satisfied with reference to sin. We see no warrant for the objection. Must we not feel that there is divine judgment against sin? Must we not think of God as requiring something in humanity which will absorb sin? Though Dr. Fleming has misunderstood Campbell's use of the term "satisfaction", Campbell actually shows the only way by which the nature of divine love can be satisfied with regard to sin. J. Dick Fleming, "Redemption" pp. 163-164.

evil in our lives with "a perfect confession of our sins."

We are not to think of this confession in any substitutionary way, but to think of it as divine nature in humanity according with the judgment of God as to the reality of sin and its inherent evil. The word confession does not partake of the nature of a substitutionary confession at all. Christ so completely in sympathy with God is in harmony with the divine judgment against sin. And this is what is meant when it is called, "a perfect Amen in humanity to the judgment of God on the sin of man." Necessarily the very nature of Christ must accord with God's condemnation of Sin. It was in the light of his oneness of will with the Father that Christ realized, "the exceeding evil of man's alienation from God." In his prayers Christ would naturally confess to the evil of man's sin which bore so heavily upon his spirit. In this too, says Campbell, we see new depth to the expression that Christ was "a sacrifice for sin". But, "Without the assumption of an imputation of our guilt, and in perfect harmony with the unbroken consciousness of personal separation from our sin (i.e. Christ knew our sin was not his), the Son of God, bearing us and our sins on his heart before the Father, must needs respond to the Father's judgment of our sins with that confession of their evil and of the righteousness of the wrath of God against them, and holy sorrow because of them, which were due, due in the truth of things, due on our behalf though we could not render it, due from him as in our nature and our true brother what he must needs feel in himself because of the holiness and love which

were in him - what he must needs utter to the Father in expiation of our sins when he would make intercession for us". 1.

It would appear that, though we have clarified to some extent the meaning of confession, we have on our hands, nevertheless, something akin to substitution, suggesting that Christ has done a work for us by way of a substitutionary expiation, on the ground of which we may be expected to receive forgiveness. This question does arise in the reader's mind, and he is inclined to ask, "How can such things be?" How is this less artificial, or less inconceivable than any other kind of substitution? Is this work of Christ the weaving of a blanket to cover over the shortcomings of men?

If we do not become impatient at this point, we can see a significance which some of the utterances have helped to obscure. Campbell is here trying to express an entirely new idea for his time under the form of the older thought. It is as though he took, so far as the retrospective aspect is concerned, the outline of the older thought and then tried to speak through it with a new spirit. We must think of Campbell as straining at the grip of new and great thoughts. We shall find that there is a high conception of the relation which these sufferings have to mankind in general. If we read Campbell aright, we discover nothing of a substitutionary character. As he proceeds, he remains true to his intention of "following the conception of the Son of God suffering in suffering flesh that which is

the perfect response of the divine holiness and divine love in humanity, to the aspect of the divine mind in the Father towards the sins of men." 1.

Campbell directs our attention to the sufferings of Christ for he considers them as intended to raise us to the apprehension "of what our sin is to the heart of God." 2 From this point of view the atonement shows us the suffering God. The nature of love would have caused God to suffer had there been no atonement. The atonement does not represent any greater suffering to God than what He always feels in view of man's evil, but now the revelation of it, raises man to the apprehension of what his sin means to God. We are able to apprehend this revelation in Christ because, "the sufferer is God in our nature." Here Campbell is voicing the deepest Christian consciousness which always thinks in terms of the Incarnation. This is a fundamental thought.

Campbell thinks of Christ as divine mind in humanity. In him is the ideal harmony of the divine in the human. In the Christian experience, there is always the desire to become conformed and transformed to the will of God, or to become increasingly partaker of the divine nature - God immanent in the soul of man. We aspire to the possession of the divine qualities of character within ourselves, and like the earliest of Christians we desire that God may dwell in our hearts. Whatever we do

1. Page 120.

2. Stevens "The Christian Doctrine of Salvation" p.393: "Only a holy being, such as he was, can adequately realize in his thought & feeling, the exceeding sinfulness of sin." Dr. Stevens recognizes this to be the underlying thought of Campbell, though paradoxically expressed. Dr. Stevens also brings Moberly into

mean by this effort of speech, it in any case bears testimony to a genuine reality. The Christian in his deepest communion and in his highest aspiration does feel that somehow he is environed by God, that in Him he lives and moves and has his being. Campbell felt all this and was clearly sensible to it. To him, there was in Christ the perfect union of the divine and human. Only such a one could reveal God, for only such as he could be a representative of the divine mind, and at the same time show forth perfect humanity. Only this perfect expression of divinely infused humanity could suffer in humanity what God suffers because of sin. He alone could honour completely the highest ideal, the law of the Kingdom of God. He was the beloved Son. In the light of this Incarnation, Campbell says we must always link together the two texts, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father", and "I am the way the truth and the life, no man cometh unto the Father but by me."

We can understand why Campbell speaks of the Incarnation as going deeper than is often supposed. It does more than give us an opportunity to envisage God. The Incarnation at the same time makes clear that there is a filial relation implied in that revelation. "We see the Father when we see the Son, not merely because of identity of will and character in the Father and the Son, but because a father as such is known only in his relation to a son." In other words, we see a great deal by seeing God in Christ, but we see partially if we do not see the same classification, but as we shall later indicate, these two should not be classed as one in theory.

filial relation revealed as well. Without Christ it is true we could not have known God as He is; neither would we understand that we are sons of God, to live, not in a far country feeding on the husks of life, but in the warm light of the love of the Father.

The Son of God whom we have now seen, the divine in humanity, would bear on his heart the sins of his brethren. He would confess them before the Father, and would he not plead for mankind in deepest intercession that they too might come forth into his marvellous light? This is what Campbell means by ^{Christ} confessing and repenting for his brethren, i.e. he turns to God for them, not to be a substitute for their guilt or punishment, but because the divine mind in humanity will necessarily suffer through work and prayer until all men are brought into a knowledge of the truth. So that the divine mind in humanity pleads not only with men, but its great love wrings out its heart of anguish before the throne of God. You may, "call this an atoning confession of our sins or not," but it was "most certainly a confession of our sins which must have been present in his intercession for us", because of the nature of the love that was in him.

The analogy which in our lives best represents this kind of suffering is, "the tears of holy sorrow shed over the sins of others, the tears for example of a godly parent over a prodigal child..." The prayer that arises is intercession. Campbell makes clear that here we are dealing with a great truth, "the truth that God grieves over our sins." And then

Campbell expresses what we may take as the clue to his meaning of the manner in which the suffering we have considered, can be and is an atonement. "The faith that God so grieves is infinitely more important as having power to work holiness in us", than that faith which rests on the belief that Christ's sufferings were penal. The sufferings have a power to work holiness in us. Only as we see what the divine feelings are in relation to sin, can we be purified. It alone, "perfectly reveals and in revealing vindicates the name and character of God, condemning us in our own eyes and laying us prostrate in the dust because we have sinned against such a God." 1.

Though the older idea of Christ's suffering may fitly pass away, we cannot set aside the great truth that his suffering was yet for others, "for the sin of others than the sufferer." It was in the deepest sense, vicarious. Only this kind of suffering can atone for sin. This suffering which Campbell contemplates in Christ, brings as he says, solemn questions to mind about this universe. He means that this vicarious suffering is one of the great facts to be known about this moral and spiritual universe. Suffering for others is a principle of the spiritual life. Only as there is this suffering can sin be conquered. By no other way than by vicarious suffering can there be atonement for sin. What has been revealed to us is divine love suffering to the uttermost for others. There is no other way given among men by which this world can be saved.

Like him we too must suffer for others. It is the way of the Cross. It is God's way for life.

It is this vicarious suffering which in its richest meaning, is the great heart of the atonement here. It is an atonement, for in it alone is the atoning power which purges us of our sins. The suffering of God made visible to us in the flesh is the power which prostrates us before the Father. It is the only power which can purge our sins,¹ burn them like dross from our lives; thus removing sin which was the great obstacle between us and God, enabling us to be at one with God, seeing Him face to face. We are cleansed by the atonement, only when under its power, we have been purified and purged of sin itself as an effect of our fellowship in the mind and spirit of Christ. In this way Christ's "perfect response absorbs sin." Sin is being swallowed up in the victory of Christ, that perfect response to the will and mind of God. 2.

"We are now able to realize that the suffering we contemplate, is divine while it is human; and that God is revealed in it, not merely in connection with it." That is to say, God suffers in humanity. God does not demand suffering of us while raised above it Himself. He is in the suffering, a sharer, so to speak, in the vicarious principle. Neither does divine love

1. pp. 120-121; cf. especially pp 166 ff.

2. In "Historic Theories of the Atonement", Robt. Mackintosh refers to the phrase "absorbs sin" saying, "Campbell still seems to hold that the anger of God was felt by Christ; and he seems to affirm that on the completion of Christ's sacrifice, the Divine anger against sin passed away." P.268. This is the very antithesis of the position. On p.269-270, however the writer admits that Campbell may have something else in mind. Campbell was delighted to discover that even Edwards did not think of

merely submit to suffering, but its divineness cannot avoid it. "Christ's suffering being thus to us a form which the divine life in Christ took in connection with the circumstances in which he was placed, and not a penal infliction coming on him as from without, such words as, 'He made his soul an offering for sin', and 'By himself he purged our sins', grow full of light." 1.

In order to safeguard himself from misunderstanding, Campbell once more emphasizes that the kind of an atonement we are contemplating, "reveals itself in a far other way than as men have spoken of the divinity of the Saviour," in making atonement for us. Christ is brought before us, and in him we see the divine mind in humanity burdened with "sufferings of a nature and virtue to purge our sins."

We now have before us the thought of Campbell in the second half of his sixth chapter. Campbell, however, makes some references to President Edwards, which at first glance would appear to upset much that we have now arrived at, though in reality they do not. Campbell knows perfectly well that Edwards' idea of the atonement is far from his own. We have already referred to Campbell's regret that Edwards came so near, and yet remained in the end so far from a satisfactory position.

Christ as receiving the anger of God. Campbell does say that Christ receives "a full apprehension and realization" of God's wrath, but it is another matter to regard this wrath as personally received. Campbell has no intention of suggesting that there is no further condemnation of sin after Christ.

But Campbell's central reference to Edwards in the sixth chapter, has actually introduced confusion into the lofty thought which he himself expresses. There is an explanation for this.

Campbell is very charitable and very generous to all whose views he considers. Attention was called to this in the case of Luther. But with Edwards, Campbell goes further. Edwards gave him a phrase which assisted his thinking on the atonement. Just as Kant was awakened from his "dogmatic slumbers" by Hume, and then went far beyond Hume, so Edwards threw a shaft of light on a specific problem on which Campbell was engaged. It was Edwards' statement that the only possible alternative to Christ's punishment for human sin was, in his opinion, "an equivalent sorrow and repentance" rendered by finite beings themselves.¹ But Edwards perceived that finite creatures could not make such adequate repentance, so he discarded this alternative and returned to his original assumption that Christ came to bear the punishment of our sin.

When Campbell read the statement of Edwards, its uniqueness struck him. He came to the conclusion that had Edwards not been so influenced by the supposed requirement to regard Christ as punished for our sins, he might have conceived that the life and work of Christ was just that which divine love intended to be the agency which would bring about this adequate repentance in us. The critic has jumped to the conclusion that

¹. Satisfaction For Sin. Chap. II, 1-3. It is usually supposed that the alternative in Edwards' mind was an adequate vicarious repentance rendered by Christ. This is not so.

Campbell has in mind a substitutionary vicarious repentance. Nothing could be further from the facts. To think this is to miss entirely the depth of Campbell's thought.

The content of Campbell's theory was in fact worked out before he ever read this phrase of Edwards. In preparing the first chapters of his book, Campbell carefully examined the views of Luther and the Calvinists on the subject of the atonement, in an effort "to discern any element of truth present in what I read". During this analysis he came upon the statement of Edwards, and concluded that Edwards approached the verge of "a moral and spiritual atonement which was occupying my own thoughts." Campbell, therefore, desired to give President Edwards credit for starting in a direction which, had he pursued it, might have had interesting results. 1. It was Campbell who followed the idea into fields of thought which were unknown to Edwards.

The use of the term "repentance" applied to Christ however is admirably suited to misdirect the reader. Campbell knows what repentance is in itself; he understands the contrition which goes along with it, such as sorrow and remorse for personal sins, and he knows and says that this personal consciousness of guilt was not present with Christ, and yet he uses the word repentance. He does not have in mind the customary meaning, which is perfectly evident when we recall the description of the suffering sorrow of the Master. That suffering which is for others, and which Campbell so plainly stresses, is not

repentance in the legitimate use of the word at all. The theory eludes us when we attempt to grasp its meaning in terms of repentance.¹ Even the presence of the word confession, is less disturbing than the word repentance, which is alien to the meaning to be conveyed.

Most critics run aground here and are not interested to explore further. Spencer read the first part of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* and laid it aside as unsatisfactory. Had he gone on, he would have discovered meanings which the first part does not bring out. Book reviews made short work of the strange statement of Campbell, that Christ repented for us with all the elements of a perfect repentance, except for the consciousness of guilt.

In order to understand what Campbell does mean, we must first rid ourselves of the impression that substitution is involved. It is not. If substitution does not enter, we ask what is the meaning of the strange passage? We are to conceive to ourselves how a perfectly holy and sinless person would feel with regard to sin. He would suffer under the burden of it as Christ did suffer. His great love for mankind, together with his perfect righteousness, would turn to God on behalf of men

1. It is interesting to note the following quotation from "Historic Theories of the Atonement, Robert Mackintosh p.308; "Whether the phraseology which imputes to our Lord 'repentance' is correct or is verbally incorrect, there is found in Him under His sufferings that right human attitude towards the God of holiness and of salvation which is required by the moral nature of things - an attitude which passes from him into us; which in Him and even in us pleases God." This is precisely the thought Campbell would convey here.

acknowledging the wrong of sin, while at the same time praying that the light of the Spirit might dispel the darkness. It is analagous to what we can conceive an enlightened Christian to pray for his lost brother. He would turn to God on behalf of his brother, but to repent for his brother would be impossible. Christ does not repent for us, nor for himself, but he has those feelings of the divine mind regarding sin, which when reproduced in us, cause us to repent.

It is sometimes stated that Campbell teaches the absolute impossibility for man to repent, and therefore it was necessary to make repentance for him. Campbell does not say this, but he does say that without Christ men would have been unable to make adequate repentance because of their inadequate knowledge of God. "I have not spoken of repentance as impossible to the sinner absolutely, but only apart from Christ." "To man, as related to Christ, repentance is possible, just as holiness and righteousness and love are possible." In this living way which Christ has opened for us, "repentance is a step - the first." 1

Principal Shairp records a conversation with Campbell, of which he afterward made notes. One remark is important as substantiating the present interpretation. Mr. Campbell in reply to certain criticisms remarked, "It is not that Christ's repentance is made to be the substitute for our repentance. His is not the substitute for ours, but the fountain of it. In him and in the light which he manifests of the Father's character, and of our sin only can we truly repent." 2

1. The Nature of the Atonement p. 342.
2. Memorials Vol. 11. p. 342.

Campbell desires to preserve the necessity for repentance in us as the way into the forgiveness which was always in God for us. Christ did not repent, and Campbell would admit there was nothing for him to repent of, but it is his strange way of saying that Christ could hardly have suffered more in spirit for human sin than if it had been his own. Christ felt a perfect sorrow for human sin and misery, though without "any personal consciousness of guilt." It is this last phrase which is used to safeguard the exposition against the charge of imputation in whatever form. Campbell is simply trying to come as near as possible to the principle that Christ is showing us the way to the Father. His relation to the Father, however, will have no element of guilt or consciousness of it. On the side of brotherhood we too will feel in some degree as Christ felt, but on the side of our individual relation to God, we will have the personal consciousness of guilt which Christ did not have. Campbell, recognizing the impossibility of substituted repentance, has erred in calling this process repentance as applied to Christ, and on the other hand, we err when we assume the theory to be that of vicarious substitutionary repentance, as the further development of the theory discloses.¹

1. See Nature of the Atonement p.279 where Campbell speaks of substitution as that which we could not share, and it is therefore ruled out; also p. 341; p. 274 "The conception that Christ suffered as our substitute - so by His suffering superseding the necessity for our suffering, itself implies that the sufferings of His which such expressions contemplate, must remain in their nature unknown to us; an experience in our Lord's humanity which though it has been experienced in humanity, we have not been intended to share in: is a conception that seems to me improbable in the bare statement of it." Oxenham in "The Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement p.XXII observes that Campbell had gotten beyond a theory of imputation.

Campbell was somewhat disturbed later on that the reference to Edwards was causing misunderstanding of his position. He admitted that if it were actually the case that the inclusion obscured his real meaning, he should prefer the reference left out altogether. In that case, "I should have been tempted to regret my noticing at all the idea of an alternative repentance as it passed before the mind of Edwards." ¹ Had Campbell expressed himself more clearly, this confusion could not have occurred. The inference which the reader draws from Campbell's explanation is, that between a choice of substitutionary punishment and vicarious repentance, he has chosen the latter.

It was a source of regret that his description of the atonement was looked upon as a moral impossibility. Certainly Campbell's terminology suggested this, but the reality behind the words cannot be thus regarded.

"The reviewer regards me as, while rejecting legal fictions, myself introducing a moral fiction. Of this I certainly had no consciousness or suspicion nor does the fairest weighing...enable me to see that to this I have made any approach. I can see no moral fiction in my conception of the divine mind in Christ in His response to the divine mind in the Father in relation to our sins, for it implies no fictitious consciousness in Christ, as if while so responding, God were not seeing the Son in his personal separation from sin, or were hearing his confession as the confession of guilt. Any such fictions conceived of as in the mind of the Son or of the Father, would destroy my whole conception of the atonement." ²

This explanation not only sets aside substitution, but it also removes Campbell from the charge that he regards Christ as

1. Page 345.

2. Page. 344.

inclusive humanity. Were this the case, Christ would be so identified with humanity as to contain within himself the consciousness of guilt. He does not think of humanity as an entity, as all of a piece. R.C. Moberly advances this idea, but Campbell rejected it many years before. He says plainly enough that his conception has not "represented humanity as one whole." ¹ This is to lose individual personality thinks Campbell. Furthermore this conception if consistently carried out would require us to look upon that which Christ did for humanity as a transaction, which, because done in humanity, has therefore made each individual as human, justified before God. Campbell has nothing of this kind in mind in the intended meaning of the word repentance.

Yet we must take into consideration another statement of Principal Shairp. ² He discussed with Mr. Campbell a certain book review which stated that his atonement theory presupposed a realistic theory of Christ as the root of humanity. According to Principal Shairp, Campbell did not regard this as a weighty objection. He thought that if we can believe that we live and move and have our being in God, it is not more difficult to believe that we are also in Christ.

(In so far as this may suggest the merger of the particular in the universal, we would feel required to criticize it, but

1. P. 346; cf. also Mem. Vol II, p. 343, a letter of Principal Shairp to the Rev. Donald Campbell - In speaking of "Christ as the Head of humanity, I understood your father to say that he thought it one of Mr. Maurice's great dangers to carry this so far as to absorb in it all sense of our own individuality."
2. Memorials Vol. II p. 342.

this is not the case. Fortunately we have Campbell's own words of rejoinder to the book review in question, in which he says, "I had not conception of a 'realism' which represented humanity as one whole in such a sense as would have lost to me my personality, or would have helped me to the faith of an atonement by justifying me in looking upon Christ as 'realism' appears to the reviewer to have led Luther to do, as literally 'the one sinner', chargeable, therefore, with all the sins of all partakers in humanity." ¹

Campbell would have us believe that the God in whom we live and move and have our being was in Christ working His will in humanity, that through Christ humanity as it were comes to itself, into its own at last, and that in Christ humanity finds its true being. He is the fountain of our new life with God. He is archetypal. He is the vine and we the branches. This Biblical language, however, "is undeniably practical; viz, guidance as to that exercise of the will to which our God has given the place of being the link between the highest purpose of his love for us, and the accomplishment of that purpose in us." ² But this illustration, it is further remarked, is not altogether accurate. "We are branches, but branches to which it belongs to choose whether they will abide in the vine, and as such, motives for abiding are addressed to us."

We are able to say that there is an unfeigned acceptance of the reality of the individual independent self, dependent,

1. Nature of the Atonement p. 346.

2. Christ the Bread of Life - Campbell, p. 8, italics Campbell's

however, for its highest end upon the atoning work of Christ. In the light of the foregoing, it should be clear that the language of the chapter under discussion is not attempting to use words which, by contortion of structure, will somehow include us in the merit of Christ.

The forms of expression in Campbell's sixth chapter are to some extent a concession to the Calvinistic reader in order to provide a path of transition to a broader viewpoint. Erskine, on reading the book, took for granted immediately that the reference to Edwards, "a recognized Calvinistic authority", was a "most happy finding", for he thought the book would have in consequence, an advantage "which it could not have had by any mere address to reason and conscience." Campbell we know was anxious to reach the Calvinist. Erskine seemed to feel that the inclusion of Edwards was an inducement for the Calvinist to read the volume.¹ The effort was not very successful, for it is just the introduction of this material which has stood in the way of a clear understanding of the real point involved.

There are several expressions in this abstruse chapter which elude our first attempt to grasp them. Campbell likens Christ to the supposed case of "one human spirit" having committed "all the sin of humanity", except for the consciousness of guilt, as though Christ were in Luther's phrase, "the one

1. "Letters of Thomas Erskine" p. 322. Mr. Macmillan thought the book would help Calvinists "to come into a larger place". Mem. Vol. I. p. 267.

sinner".¹ When the meaning is understood in the light of the explanation already given it becomes clear, but the illustration is too easy to misunderstand. The immediate impression comes ready to hand that here is substitutionary repentance and confession. Yet the certain truth is that Campbell does not mean what he here seems to say. He presently admits that this hypothetical illustration represents an impossible case as it stands and he realizes that what he has just written is open to a critical interpretation different from what he intends to convey. He says it may, "seem to involve all the difficulties connected with imputation of guilt and substituted punishment." "Yet it can only so appear to a hasty and superficial glance." Campbell proceeds from this point to explain himself in terms like those which we have already seen to be at the centre of his mind at this point. There is no "fiction" here, "no imputation to the sufferer of the guilt of the sin for which he suffers; but only that he has taken the nature, and become the brother of those whose sin he confesses before the Father, and that he feels concerning their sin what, as the holy one of God and as perfectly loving God and man, he must feel." ²

Campbell has attained great heights in his sixth chapter, and put forth suggestions of the loftiest kind. However, along with them he has carried modes of thought, which obscure for us the clearest insight to which he attains.

1. pp. 124-126.
2. Page 126.

This makes the interpreter's task a hard one, for it not only requires him to master, if he can, the whole of Campbell's thought, but it is also difficult to convince the reader who may have formed already an opinion on the theory. In spite of these hindrances, however, it is possible to arrive at the teaching of this section.

Christ is the great Mediator, who not only acts for God, but for humanity as well. In him the divine and human meet. What he does is ever and always the reaction of divine love in the circumstances in which it finds itself at the time. Christ is not acting out love like a part in a play; he is an incarnation of love, and what he does is the form which love takes in the given situation. So that this love present in humanity in its ideal at-one-ness with God, takes the course which love must take in humanity. Its suffering in the presence of sin we have observed. This love shows mankind the only way which there is to the Father's heart; the only way which can atone for and absorb sin; it is repentance and vicarious suffering. Christ has gone before as the elder brother bearing on his spirit the weight of human sin. He brings them in prayer before the Father, and from the depths of humanity pours forth his sorrow and his love for humanity, confessing its sin and acknowledging its evil. This is ideal humanity finding expression through Christ, crying out for humanity in deepest agony of spirit. To the mind of God this sorrow and suffering for sin is that alone in humanity which can satisfy Him and make atonement. Christ has shown forth the perfect expression of

humanity. All men, under the influence of Christ must strive too, to live in that spirit. God can be satisfied with nothing less in humanity than that attitude, that divine quality of life which accords with His judgment against sin, and suffers for sin. It is suffering for others; this is sacrifice; this is expiation. This alone can call forth forgiveness.

Campbell has put his finger on the very nature of the atonement when he grasps the meaning of the vicarious principle, only one phase of which, however, is so far before us. Any punishment which may be inflicted as a result of sin is never an atonement for sin. That is never what can satisfy God concerning us. Not until we see with God the intrinsic evil of sin, and repent of it and begin to suffer vicariously for others, can God be satisfied with us. The vicarious suffering of Christ is not to Campbell the ground of others' forgiveness, as though by some subtle form of imputation his righteousness or repentance becomes the ground of our acceptance. Christ's righteousness is our righteousness only when that righteousness has become for us the power which drives sin out of our lives.¹ Christ is the divine mind in humanity raising us to an apprehension of what our sins are to God, and what God desires us to be. His vicarious suffering in work and prayer is the principle

1. Mr. Pritchard acknowledges in his article what has just been brought out, that the confession of sin which Christ made is "that mind in humanity with which alone God is well pleased, & in which we must partake." And he further recognizes that this can be conceived without requiring to bring in at all, substitution or imputation. North British Review, June 1867.

of the Kingdom of God, and by the power of his cross alone can be burned out of our lives, the sin that hid God from us.

4. The Atonement as a Way Into Sonship.

Campbell seems to have been aware that he had not adequately set free his language from a kind of imputation which haunts his words. But he does manage to shake off this unwelcome presence. The development of the prospective aspect of the atonement with its related material, is the coup de maitre by which Campbell rids himself of the criticism that his theory has in it elements of imputation. We are to see more specifically that which divine love contemplated we should become.

The acknowledgment of sin which Christ made, is not something apart from the Christian spirit. It is a form which love took in Christ, and to the extent that it is present in us in whatever degree, love will take that form also. Campbell refers to the confession of our sin by Christ as that which also contemplated our participation in it, as an element in our actual redemption from sin. The gift of God in Christ provides, "the power to confess our sins with an amen to Christ's confession of them, true and deep in the measure in which we partake in his Spirit." ¹

It is a mistake to view the atonement simply as, "ground on which God may extend mercy" to men, as something which "is

complete in itself irrespective of any effect which is anticipated" on our part. "What I have now been representing as the true view of the atonement, is characterized by this, that it takes the results contemplated into account in considering God's acceptance of the atonement." "Not that the moral and spiritual excellence of the work of Christ could have been less than infinitely acceptable to God, viewed simply in itself; but that its acceptableness in connection with the remission of sins is only to be truly and fully seen in its relation to the result which it has contemplated, viz., our participation in eternal life." ¹ The eternal life is understood as that spiritual life of love in Christ. "In other words, the justification of God" in redeeming us, in forgiving us our transgressions, is seen in His intention that we should receive the adoption of sons. God is justified to Himself in holding out forgiveness to us, just because the purpose antecedent to that forgiveness is the desire and intention that we shall indeed be enabled through His love to live as children of the Father. In a sense therefore, the atonement is only complete and only really seen when it has caused humanity to participate in the life of sonship.

"This direct reference to the end contemplated," which distinguishes the atonement here considered from other systems, "I lay much weight upon." As now explained, we find a new content in many Scripture passages such as, "Christ suffered for

us, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God." ¹ Instead of thinking of this result, this bringing us to God, as a remote consequence flowing from the death of Christ, while the immediate interest of his death is the forgiveness of sins through his punishment for them, Campbell would say, there is in fact a direct connection between Christ's suffering and the life of sonship in us. Our prospective life of sonship is not an indirect result of an external atonement, but a direct result which ~~that~~ suffering has stimulated in us. Our apprehension of Christ's suffering is in direct relation, therefore, to our receiving the gift of eternal life, and this result is that in which the remission of our sins is justified.

We are now prepared "to find that the perfect righteousness of the Son of God in humanity is itself the gift of God to us in Christ; to be ours as Christ is ours, to be partaken in as he is partaken in, to be our life", for his righteousness is really a life in which we participate, "instead of its being as has been said, ours by imputation."

"Abstractly considered, and viewed simply in itself, the divine righteousness that is in Christ must be recognized as a higher gift than any benefit it can be supposed to purchase. In the immediate contemplation of the life of Christ, seen as that on which the Father is fixing our attention when He says of Christ, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased," it cannot be questioned, that the choice being offered, on the one hand, to partake in this divine righteousness, or, on the other, either to have it imputed to us, and on account of such imputation, to have a title to any supposed rewards

of righteousness, or to have these rewards without such imputation transferred to us, there could be no hesitation what choice to make. Apart altogether from the difficulties involved in the conception of the imputation of righteousness, or the transference of its effects, it would manifestly be a dishonour done to the divine righteousness to prefer to it any good of any kind external to it, not inherent in it but separable from it, which might be conceived of as its reward." ¹

When we consider the nature of the atonement here unfolding itself, in its relation to the remission of sins, the simplicity of its character delivers us from perplexity and confusion. We are freed from artificial and unethical arrangements, and observe instead, that the immediate and direct occupation of our spirits in the spiritual life that is beheld in Christ, occupying ourselves with that righteousness is, "itself salvation". We are given in Christ the "benefit of what he was in humanity." We identify ourselves with him in his confession and intercession, so also we merge ourselves with him in that righteousness which was his. He is for us the light, the truth, the way.

When Campbell speaks of Christ's confession, "which the Father receives on behalf of all men as the righteousness of humanity," ² he has in mind a remarkably rich content which these words themselves do not convey. We can agree, however, that the exposition of the idea is "as remote from imputation of righteousness, as Christ's bearing our sins...is from imputation to him of our sins". ³

There is a light shed on what humanity was created to be

1. Page 133.
2. " 137.
3. " 139.

by what Christ did. We now see the evil of man's sinful condition, but in him we see humanity's "great capacity for good as that capacity is brought out by the Son of God". Humanity as it is in its sinful condition, has dishonoured God and so stands unworthy before Him. But in Christ, ideal humanity, divine humanity, suffers and prays for mankind as only love knows how, and in doing so, reveals the "inestimable preciousness that was hidden in humanity, hidden from the inheritors of humanity themselves, but not hid from God and now brought forth in manifestation by the Son of God." ¹ It is for the sake of that side of humanity, that capacity of sonship in humanity, that God does not hide his love from mankind. This capacity in humanity is to be nourished by Christ, by what he did, by our following in his righteousness, and because of this contemplated result, God is justified in forgiving men their trespasses. When the life of sin is replaced by that of sonship through fellowship in that suffering righteousness of the Master, then the justice and love of God are satisfied.

In the manner described is Christ's work "accepted on behalf of all men." "Indeed the evidence abounds that it was this which was ever in the contemplation of Christ in glorifying the Father on earth; while of anything like the consciousness of working out a righteousness to be imputed to men to give them a legal ground of confidence towards God, there is no trace.

1. Page 138.

2. " 149

3. " 149.

"How can we think of the Father's testimony to the Son as other than a commending of sonship to us, or think of the Father's delight in the Son otherwise than as what justifies His imparting the life of sonship to us? "Let us in this light regard Christ's being delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification."

The capacity for righteousness in humanity, the capacity for sonship, however, is relative to our relation to Christ. It is only as we share in the work of the atonement, only as we participate in that eternal quality of the life of Christ, that the dormant capacities hidden in humanity flower forth as a Kingdom of God within.^{us} The capacity is in human nature, but it requires the touch of the Spirit through the apprehension of Christ to make it live. "Therefore, there must be a relation between the Son of God and the sons of men, not according to the flesh only, but also according to the Spirit, the second Adam must be a quickening Spirit, and the head of every man be Christ".¹ There is an internal process wherein spirit with spirit can meet, and it is the spiritual essence of the work of Christ which alone can find a response in our consciences, and therefore be the channel for the atonement of humanity.

Christ is a constant witness of the Father to men, but "His own consciousness in humanity witnessed within him that humanity was capable of being filled with the life of love."

1. Page. 138.

2. " 140.

"The more perfectly he realized that these were his brethren whose hatred was coming forth against Him, the more ~~had~~ he realize also that this hatred was not of the ~~essence~~ of their being; that there was hope in giving Himself for them to redeem them from iniquity, that there was hope in suffering for them, just for the unjust, hope that he would bring them to God. How manifestly has the joy of this hope underlain all his sorrow! It was indeed the joy that was set before Him, for which He endured the cross, despising the shame. He bore the contradiction of sinners against Himself, not only in meekness and patience of love, and the unselfishness of love, which was more deeply grieved that they should offend, than that itself was offended against; but also IN THE PROPHETIC FAITH OF LOVE THAT LOOKED FORWARD TO YET BECOMING ITSELF THE LIFE OF THOSE WHO NOW REJECTED IT." By making the Father known would this be accomplished. "O righteous Father, the world hath not known Thee." "IF THE WORLD COULD CONTINUE TO BE THE WORLD AFTER COMING TO KNOW THE FATHER, THERE WOULD HAVE BEEN NO HOPE FOR THE WORLD." 1

Thus the great sorrow which we have seen manifested in Christ's communing anguish with the Father, was buoyed up and strengthened by the faith this his witness of the Father and his sacrifice would purge sin from human life. When Christ prayed, "Father forgive them for they know not what they do", there was implied in it the hope that they were even yet capable of being redeemed. He who made this prayer, and who knew what was in man, was sustained in sacrificing himself unto death "by the consciousness in his own humanity of a knowledge of the Father, which being partaken in, had power to redeem humanity." 2 "Our Lord knew that he had come a light into the world, that he that believed in him should not abide in darkness but should have the light of eternal life." "The sad sorrowful

1. Page 140.

2. " 141.

work of being a light condemning the darkness was, therefore, cheered by the consciousness of not only being light in himself, but the light of the world, i.e., the light for men, a light which his own human consciousness ever testified to be a light for men." ¹

"Thus are we to conceive of Christ as contented to be through suffering made perfect as the Captain of our salvation." The divine Providence sent him forth to be a revealer of the Father, and of uplifted humanity, and he welcomed whatever came, "which had reference to the development of the life of love that was in him according to all the need of man." He learned obedience by the things which he suffered, that being made perfect, he might become the author of our salvation. He was tempted in all points as we are tempted, that, sinlessly passing through such trial, he might be a High Priest to us in our hour of temptation. "In all ways of manifestation of the life of sonship, and at all cost to himself, he declared that Father's name in life and in death, that the love wherewith the Father had loved him might be in us and he in us". ²

The great Mediator at one and the same time revealed both God and man. In him humanity and God meet in fullest union. "Apart from Christ we know not our God, and apart from Christ

1. Page 141.

2. Compare this paragraph with the following from Mr. Pritchard's ~~article~~, "For although the sonship in him was always perfect sonship, yet it was manifested in his own consciousness, as well as in the Father's sight and in real fact, through the successive steps of the path by which he was led by the Father, making the Captain of our salvation perfect through suffering." This revelation of the Father which He made during His life, and this brotherly love which was but another aspect of the same life He completed in his last suffering and death.

we know not ourselves." By not having sufficiently seen man revealed in Christ, we have lost much of the **vision** of God in Christ. By thinking of Christ as fulfilling a legal law, men have failed to read the heart of God. Similarly, the point of view which advocates imputation in any degree, is not only "turned away from seeing God in Christ, but has also been turned away from seeing man in Christ, seeing themselves in Christ seeing the capacities of their own being in Christ." ¹ Christ showed forth, "in humanity the power of the law of the spirit of his own life; the life of sonship." "We know not the truth of humanity, we know only its perversion while we are living the life of self and enmity, and are as gods to ourselves. What it is to be a man, what we possess in humanity, we never know until we see humanity in Him, who through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God." And this has been in order that we might be lifted from evil into newness of life, and be enabled to do what hitherto we could not do. "We then for whose sakes this has been, must learn to see in this revelation of what humanity is when pervaded with life of sonship, that redemption of which we were capable, and which we have in Christ...". ² By knowing that Christ is the beloved son, we know, "the Father's desire as to ourselves." This new life is "itself riches, unsearchable infinite riches, because it, and it alone enjoys the Father as the Father, making us heirs with

1. Page. 145. cf. Campbell's "Christ The Bread of Life". P.186

2. " 145.

God, and joint heirs with Jesus Christ."

"Let us not think of Christ, therefore, simply as revealing how kind and compassionate God is, and how forgiving to our sins, as those who have broken His righteous law. Let us think of Christ as the Son who reveals the Father, that we may know the Father's heart against which we have sinned, that we may see how sin, in making us godless, has made us as orphans, and understand that the grace of God, which is at once the remission of past sin, and the gift of eternal life, restores to our orphan spirits their Father, and to the Father of spirits His lost children." ¹

Again and again Campbell lays stress on the atonement as a way into sonship with God, and each time he cautions the reader to observe that his meaning is altogether apart from external arrangement which could be interpreted in the least degree as a form of imputation. And we have felt the need of reiterating this from time to time in the present interpretation, just because so many writers, admitting the beauty and strength of much of Campbell's thought, conclude in the end that he did not escape from legal entanglements. Christ's "righteousness is not the past fact of legal obligation discharged, but the mind of sonship towards the Father; for in the beloved Son is the Father seen to be well pleased, and in our being through him to the Father dear children, will it come to pass that the Father will be well pleased in us." ²

Expiation takes on, therefore, a new shade of meaning. The attitude alone in humanity which can satisfy God, we have

1. Page. 147.

2. " 145. italics Campbell's.

noted, but in it we must participate. The work of Christ has a power to lift us up into itself as we yield to its influence upon us. And this is the only door through which we can be raised to newness of life. Christ is "the way into the holiest and the only way." "Its result in us will only be limited as the measure of our being yielded up to it is limited." ¹

The atonement is, therefore, completed for me when I through Christ, because of Christ, am lifted into sonship with him. Sin is progressively being wiped out, expiated by the atonement. The atonement is still fulfilling itself in Christian lives. The Cross is even now drawing men. The atonement anticipates the development of the same vicarious love in us, and the atonement is not complete, has not served its object, until we are carried along with it into the life of the spirit of love. The divine Son of God goes forth to redeem humanity, and he brings humanity back with him as sons of God.

5. Another Aspect of the Love that Turns to God in Prayer.

Campbell follows his exposition of the contemplated life of sonship held out to all in Christ, with a section on, "Christ's dealing with ^{the} Father on Behalf of Men" on its prospective side. In reality this is but the continuation of what immediately preceded, while it is the completion of Christ's communion earlier considered. The way into sonship, which is the prospective aspect of the atonement, naturally had a prominent place in Christ's communion with the Father. Just as the deep feelings produced by man's sin found utterance in burdened prayer to God; so also the yearning for man's participation in the life of sonship expressed itself through earnest supplication. The one is not understandable without the other, and both are modes which love will take in prayer. So that we really have, not two distinct types of prayer, but one. The prayer which is weighted by sorrow over sin is one with the burning desire which longs for the light of God to purify the heart of man. And Campbell would have us think of Christ's intercession in this manner. The arbitrary subject divisions of the book may suggest actual separation of the elements, but its author would save us from the error. Campbell acknowledges that his earlier treatment of Christ's intercession for us, was hampered by withholding for the time being, Christ's aspiration for our sonship.¹ Whereas the nature of the prayer and of him who made it required both phases. The confession which acknowledged our sin, could not stop there, but must be also a

prayer for our participation in eternal life, to which his confession of our sins led forward. Each, therefore, would have little meaning without the other.

Christ, in dealing with God on man's behalf, does not because of his perfection in humanity, approach God asking for something to be bestowed on us which he himself has earned for us. The construction of certain passages might suggest this, but what Christ prays for man is not unreal; it is the result of the perfect outlet of love. We have observed already that what Christ was "necessarily desiring for us, was the fellowship of what he himself was in humanity." "This, therefore, was that which he would ask for us." And when Campbell says that along with this prayer, Christ presents his own perfection in humanity, he means by it that Christ presented this perfected humanity as that of which humanity is capable. The light that he had could dwell also in man. This alone is "The right conception of Christ pleading his own merits on our behalf." "Our capacity of that which he asked for us was implied" in those merits which were his; "and the Father's delight in these merits so implied His delight in their reproduction in us, that the prayer which proceeds on these grounds is manifestly according to the will of the Father." ¹

The doing of the Father's will, i.e. expressing the divine mind of love in human life, would not be complete unless it did yearn for humanity to share in it. The vicarious principle which we saw suffering for others, includes the desire for

men to share in sonship. God's satisfaction with the work of Christ is not separated from the anticipation of our traversing Christ's footsteps as well. It anticipated "our yet living to God - our partaking in eternal life ..." The "dealing of the Son with the Father on our behalf" is thus seen in a manner which makes it a gift of life to us.¹ "What is thus offered on our behalf is so offered by the Son and so accepted by the Father, entirely with the prospective purpose that it is to be reproduced in us."²

The confession of our sin which was acceptable to God, was acceptable only because it was that condition of mind in relation to sin, in the fellowship of which, we are to come to God. And that righteous "walking in love which we have been contemplating as Christ's righteousness, is to be shared in by us: to accept it on our behalf as the righteousness of man was to accept it as what pleases God in man, what alone can please God in man, therefore as that in the fellowship of which we are to draw near and live that life which is in God's favour."³ That which is acceptable to God from man is that life which God has given us in Christ. So that the "ultimate foundation" of the atonement as here conceived, is in God Himself. Christ came to do and express the will of God, "and which by doing the Son has revealed the name of God," which "is itself the ultimate peace and rest of our spirits." We are not to seek in the atonement any "confidence towards God distinct from what it has revealed as the mind of God towards man", "and what God desires of man."⁴

1.- Mr. Pritchard writes: "These elements of the atonement he teaches are not to be beyond human experience or inconceivable to it, but as actually reproduced in a lower measure in the mind of Christ's true followers." North British Review, June 1867.

2.- pages 152-153

3.- page 153

4.- page 197

Campbell recognizes how easy it is to mistake intercession and to think of it as an attempt to do something to God, or cause Him to do what He might not be ready to do. Intercession here is understood as prayer which ascends naturally from the life of love. "No feeling in the Son, no desire, no prayer, is other than what is natural and inevitable to holy love so placed." And this is very important to a right understanding of Campbell. The Christian is not to rest in any work performed for him by Christ whether that be conceived of as vicarious punishment or vicarious repentance. What we have been able to observe in Christ was that which was natural to holy love, while the ground of our confidence is in the character of God Himself. When we enter into fellowship in the mind and spirit of Christ, we are at one with the revealed God, who is our Father.

Systems of theology had been too much "looking on the work of Christ as the acting out of a prearranged plan, so that its character as a natural progress and development is with difficulty realised." We must deliver ourselves from "the painful temptation to think of Christ's work as almost a scenic representation...." We must understand that there was in Christ a deep personal feeling for us, a yearning for us as brothers. Unless we realise the great love in him for us, a love which was as strong in our direction as that toward the Father whom he loved with all his heart and mind and soul and strength, we cannot understand his suffering, and know "what it was to his heart that we were to the Father rebellious children." If we do not see this personal feeling for us, we cannot understand that "nothing could satisfy his heart as a redemption for us

but that we should come to follow God as children in fellowship of his own sonship." This love for us was at work in him influencing him in all that he did, otherwise we see him as acting a part, and we miss the deep reality of his suffering for us. It was in this spirit that he prayed for us, interceded for us, and he could do so with confidence, for he was sustained by the faith that in God also there was a strong yearning over men His offspring.

Christ could, therefore, pray for man because he knew the hope that was in God for man, and because in his own conscious experience in humanity, he realised and testified that these yearnings could be satisfied.¹ Christ knew that divinity in humanity overcomes human frailty, and Christ manifested that the spirit and mind of God in humanity can enable humanity to present itself unspotted before God. Humanity motivated and filled with the Spirit can be lifted into sonship. The great beloved Son showed forth what divinity in humanity can accomplish with humanity. The yearnings which God had for mankind, Christ saw could be fulfilled in humanity, for he had demonstrated and revealed this in himself. And because of this and of his conscious oneness with God, his unstained and victorious humanity would and could raise its voice in intercessory prayer.

Campbell very acutely remarks that there is a difficulty which arises here, as there is in all prayer. It is the question of how far prayer is essential to attain that which God desires to give.

In Christ, ideal divine humanity cries out for men in suffering love, and God grants this petition in giving men the privileges of sonship, but God has thus given what he desired to give. The intercessory prayer is what God expected love in humanity to voice. If this intercession had not been present, God could not be known to us as He now is. This is not because Christ changed God, but because this kind of prayer is a revelation of love to us and without which we could not know the nature of love so well, and therefore, would have missed much of God. Without this prayer, the answer desired by the prayer could hardly have been received. What the prayer desired was in a measure fulfilled in the prayer itself. Prayer is an integral part of the life of sonship and without which that life is incomplete: manifested.

Furthermore, the prayer here conceived is in every respect genuine, and genuine prayer accomplishes something. If God is not to be regarded as a fate, we must think of prayer as having a place and a power in the Kingdom of God. "God is not revealed to our faith as a fate, neither is His will set before us as a decree of destiny." "God is revealed to us as a living God," and His will as a desire and choice for us is not pictured to us as predetermined to make us sons irrespective of our response. On the contrary the will of God is shown as a moral and spiritual choice for us, and our prayer is to be a response calling forth a moral and spiritual choice in us.

"That knowledge of the Father which the prayer of Christ implied;...was not the knowledge of a certain future, predestined and sure to be accomplished, but was the knowledge of the unchanging will of the Father concerning man; a will which in all rebellion

is resisted and in all obedience of love is fulfilled."¹

It is because the nature of the universe is such that there is a free and undetermined area in the relation of God and man, that makes Christ's prayer for man so genuinely the sincere outburst of love. If we were predetermined to be either saved or lost, his intercession could have no meaning. The atoning love of Christ reaches out to touch all men and to infuse them with a similar love. If we meditate on the manner in which Christ must have prayed, we will come to see it "as that response to the mind of the Father in relation to us, which in our participation in the Spirit of the Son is to be continued and perpetuated in our own prayers."² The intercession of Christ and our own prayers should mutually illustrate each other. In Christ, however, the intercession was "infinitely intense just because of his perfect oneness of mind with the Father in regard to what he asked...." When we can enter into the spirit of that prayer, we will be rising not only to the demand to love the Lord our God with all the heart and mind and soul and strength, but meeting the requirement to love our neighbour as self. We have in intercessory prayer, therefore, perfect sonship, because it is also perfected brotherhood.

6. Sonship as Salvation.

The atonement as that which revealed the nature of God, is the flame which alone can dispel the dark evil of our lives.

1 - page 205.

2 - page 205.

"God is light and in Him is no darkness at all." So that, "as to our past sins, we not only see that the atonement here presented to our faith is far more in harmony with the righteous law of God against which we had sinned, than any penal infliction for our sins, whether endured by another for us, or endured by ourselves in abiding misery could have been...." The gift of God given to us in Christ has given to us, "the power to confess our sins with an amen to Christ's confession of them, true and deep in the measure in which we partake in his Spirit." We "begin our new life with partaking in the mind of Christ concerning our old life.." Our first perception of what holiness, truth, righteousness and love are, comes to us through seeing what holiness and love suffer because of sin. We welcome the fellowship of the mind of Christ as the first breathing of the life of sonship. This intention for us as participating in the atonement, "is more glorifying to the divine delight in righteousness than any other conception that has been entertained."¹

Cleansing from sin is the first effect of our relation to the atonement. We are cleansed in no legal manner, but are purified from sin as an effect of fellowship in the spirit of Christ, which effect can alone explain that fellowship. "To say that 'the blood of Christ cleanseth us from all sin', and to say that it 'purges the conscience from dead works to serve the living God', are but different ways of declaring the spiritual power of the atonement when apprehended by faith,

asserting its fitness for being partaken in by us as the mind of Christ in relation to our sin."¹ Nothing could be more vague or "unsuited to the real need of our spirits..... than the kind of meaning associated with our being 'washed in the blood of Christ'.." "But if the blood of Christ be to our thoughts the spiritual reality which was in Christ's making his soul an offering for sin, then to be washed in the blood of Christ must be to have the moral and spiritual elements of that offering revealed in our spirits, so bringing us into spiritual harmony with them..."² This fellowship cleanses us from all un-
:righteousness and satisfies God regarding us. This alone can be ground for forgiveness.

When the Scriptures³ refer to our having an advocate with the Father, and that he is a propitiation for our sin, we are saved from the customary wrong interpretation says Campbell, by placing particular emphasis on the passage: "These things I write unto you, that ye sin not." In order that we sin not, our attention is directed to Christ's righteousness. "He is made of God unto us righteousness, and righteousness is in him for us as the sap is in the vine for the branch." We have fellowship with him in spirit. Christ, is a propitiation for our sins in the respect that his righteousness is that kind of righteousness fitted for our needs, fitted to deliver us from sin. And Christ continues to be for every man the propitiation for sin, for He continues to be the channel of reconciliation.

1 - page 169.

2 - page 251.

3 - 1st Epistle of John.

"We are not thrown back as on a past fact."¹ The revelation of this reconciliation stands as the ever present way to the Father. It is the way of Christ. He that "abideth in Him ought himself also so to walk even as He walked."

"I know," says Campbell, "that this view of making reconciliation for our sins as being the ministering to us a present help according to our spiritual need - enabling us to be at peace with God spiritually, and therefore truly, enabling us to worship God,.... is not the view usually taken."² Campbell admits that his use of the terms, "propitiation" and "reconciliation" are so used that they are "a departure from prevailing associations with the sacred language." The nature of the atonement as here developed, "necessitates our giving a moral and spiritual meaning as distinguished from a mere legal meaning to the expressions, 'peace with God', 'reconciliation with God', 'propitiation for sin'..."³ "The immediate and only natural reflection in seeing the pardon of our sins as the gospel reveals it, is that we are free to draw near to God to join in the services of the true sanctuary, and in the spirit of sonship to have communion with our heavenly Father."

"Christ's suffering the just for the unjust simply suggests the purpose of bringing us to God..." There was in His suffering "the direct purpose of bringing the unjust to God." To suppose that Christ suffered that we might not suffer, or that He repented that we might not repent, or that He filled up a work

1 - page 170.
2 - page 172.
3 - page 178.

that we could not finish, is to miss the central purpose of the atonement as fitted to purge us of our sins and enable us to receive the adoption of sons. Sonship is salvation.

Salvation for us in terms of sonship has been determined by God's own fatherliness and our capacity of sonship. These two determined the nature of the grace extended to us. Therefore, "the pardon of our sin in any other sense than the revealing and the opening to us of the path of life, is now to us as undesirable as, in relation to the moral government of the Father of our spirits, it is inconceivable."¹ Consequently we are not to seek an arrangement which first disposes of God's wrath, as though that being appeased, we are safe to have relations with Him. "We have here to do with persons; the Father of spirits and His offspring."² Our attention should be centred on God as He is in Himself. The peace that is with God is "found in a knowledge of the Father." We participate in that knowledge through Christ, "participating in what he was." "The nature of that hope which was in God for man, and which the atonement has brought within reach of our spirits, has indeed been necessarily determined by our ultimate and primary relation to God as the Father of our spirits."³ To this light we take all our conceptions and test them there.

The fatherliness of God "is itself that in which the saving power resides." "For as we have seen, the Son of God saves us by a work whose essence and sum is the declaring of the Father's name", i.e. we are saved through knowing what God is, and not

1 - page 182
2 - page 184
3 - page 186

through a transaction worked out for us. "That God should by a miracle change a rebellious child into a loving child would be no such glory to God as that the knowledge of the fatherliness rebelled against should, by virtue of the excellence inherent in that fatherliness, accomplish this result."¹ It is evident to Campbell, "that the will of God must reconcile us to itself by the power of what it is or not at all." "Therefore, that the Son reconciles us to the Father by revealing the Father, is not only a way of salvation, but is in truth the only way."

"So that our salvation would have been impossible had there not been in the Father, what, being revealed to us, and brought to bear on our spirits, would reconcile us to Him, making his condemnation of our sin to become our own condemnation of it, His choice for us our own free choice for ourselves, His love the light of life to us, His fatherliness the quickening of sonship in us."²

The question of salvation is seen to be the question of participation in the outgoing of a living love. Sanctification and justification are in the closest relation to the atonement. Christ becomes our life, and so long as we are abiding in that life we grow from more to more. What we are to seek in the atonement is, "the secret and the power of returning to God..." There is a oneness of our confidence to approach God quickened in us by Christ in faith, with that confidence "in which Christ went before us in that path of life which he has opened for us."

The glorious victory of Christ in humanity is that in which man may rejoice. The "preciousness of Christ's perfection sheds its own glory over all humanity, being ever to the heart

1 - page 292.

2 - page 293.

of the Father a promise for all humanity." "The heart of the Father waits in hope for our growing up into Him in all things which is the head even Christ."¹ It is not necessary, therefore, to "introduce a fiction" to give a character of perfection to our individual righteousness. It is contemplated that we are to be made righteous. The faith which is quickened in us by the revelation of the Father, has its witness in itself, its sanction in its own nature. Our consciences testify to the correctness of the spiritual relation in which we are placed. We feel nothing artificial, but believe we are face to face with a deep reality. When we are in this relation, we are justified and are being sanctified.² We do not have to infer this, for in the light of the love of God and the spiritual relation opened to us by the work of Christ, we cannot doubt that we now have the beginning of confidence and are in that state which God desired for us. Our apprehension of the atonement awakened in us the unquestioned certainty of our sin, and now by participation in that atonement through faith, it is just as natural to be deeply certain that this faith justifies and sanctifies. We have, if only in part, the same faith that was in Christ. "In uttering in whatever feebleness, a true Amen to that high Amen, the individual is yielding himself to the spirit of Christ" and is thus "accepted of God."

"Now that we have seen, "what the divine fatherliness must be, what it must desire, what alone can satisfy it, we come to see the work of redemption in the light of our ultimate and root relation to God as the

1 - page 192.

2 - cf. pages 300-305.

Father of our spirits, with whom abides the fountain of life." "We see that, however we had departed from God, our true well being continued to be, and must ever continue to be so bound up in what God is to us in Himself, and what the aspect of our mind is towards Him, as that nothing external to this, nothing in God's outward dealing with us, nothing that He can give or we can receive, nothing that is not included in the state of our own spirits towards God, and the response in our own hearts to that which is in His heart towards us - can be our salvation."¹

Our "salvation is joining in that worship of God which is in spirit and in truth." The way into the holiest which humanity needs is the way into the Father's heart. The "blood of Christ... hath consecrated" such a way. But the blood of Christ we think of in spiritual terms. We think of it spiritually as "a power to influence the spirits washed in it by faith." And "in proportion as it is seen that that which expiates sin must be something that meets a demand of the divine righteousness, the superiority of a moral and spiritual atonement consisting in the right response from humanity to the divine mind in relation to sin becomes clear." The kind of atonement we see here is what in the spiritual nature of things alone could be. There needed to be an atonement for sin, and the Father's heart asked for it "simply on the ground that it desired us back to itself, and therefore desired a living way of return related in its nature to the nature of our departure in order that our return might be a real return."² The way could be only such as was opened to us by the Son of God, "for he alone knew the exceeding sinfulness of our sins, and feel

¹ - pages 154-155.

² - 159-160

regarding them in that mind, the fellowship in which was to be our purgation from them." There was a "moral and spiritual impossibility of our returning to the Father of our spirits, except on such a path as this which Christ has opened for us..." The very constitution of our spiritual being precludes the possibility of our partaking in the divine nature except as we enter into it with a mind of at-one-ness with Christ, in fellowship with divine humanity. It is "impossible that God should receive us with welcome and acknowledgment if coming by any other path than the fellowship of that ¹expiation."

Campbell would impress upon his reader with vigor, the moral and spiritual nature of the atonement, and so therefore, of our salvation. The fact that God is a Father and that in us is the capacity for sonship, made the atonement what it was, and in the nature of the case it could not have been different.

"Had there been in the universe but one moral being related to God as each of us is, and though God should be contemplated in His dealing with that individual being as acting exclusively as the Father of that spirit, seeking to realise the yearning of his fatherly heart in relation to that spirit, the necessity for the atonement would, as respected that individual, have been still what it has been; nor could the fulfilment of the Father's desire for that one man have been possible otherwise than through the opening of that fountain for sin and for uncleanness" which is presented to us by the manner in which Christ shed his life and blood for us.²

We are thus confined to the faith that there is but one path of life for us because there is only one path to the Father. "I am the way, the truth and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me." These words "reveal a fixed and

¹ - page 160
² - page 161

immutable constitution of things." In other words, the way of the Cross is the way of life. The way of the Cross leads through Gethsemane and rises with Christ in the resurrection. The Cross is there at the summit and we must have fellowship with him who reached that height. There is no door which opens "to the hope of being easily dealt with, the hope of experiencing a soft, accommodating indulgence, that in weak tenderness would bend the divine requirement to what we are." Let us no longer be interested in systems of rewards and punishments such as "men have ignorantly engrafted on the Gospel" says Campbell.

"The Gospel truly apprehended, raises us into another and a higher region, a region indeed in which divine mercy or clemency as previously conceived of, is felt to have been but as the dimmest twilight of kindness and good will towards men, in comparison with the noonday light of the love of the Father of spirits to his offspring; but a region also in which no arbitrary dealing with us can find a place.".....
 "The Father as the Father can only receive his offspring to Himself as coming to Him in the spirit of sonship; - neither otherwise than as coming in the spirit of sonship can they in spirit and in truth draw near to Him."¹

"If we will come to the atonement, not venturing in our darkness to determine anything as to its nature, but expecting light to shine upon our spirits from it, even the light of eternal life; if we will suffer it to inform us by its own light why we needed it, and what its true value to us is, the punishment of sin will fall into its proper place as testifying to the existence of an evil greater than itself, even sin; from which greater evil it is the direct object of the atonement to deliver us...." "And the reward of righteousness will be raised in our conception from the character of something that can be ours by the adjudication of the judge on arbitrary grounds which mercy may recommend, to its true dignity as that blessedness which is essentially inherent in righteousness, and in that glorifying and enjoying of God which righteousness alone is the capacity and which no name, nor title, nor arbitrary arrangement

can confer."¹

God has accepted the work of Christ as the atoning way of reconciliation. When in fellowship with the mind of God in Christ, the human spirit responds in wholehearted sympathy, then that response "is seen to be what the divine righteousness will necessarily acknowledge as THE END OF THE ATONEMENT ACCOMPLISHED."² "We rejoice to find ourselves shut up to so great salvation."

7. The Relation of Mankind to the Final Period of Christ's Suffering.

Campbell's ideas on the final sufferings of Christ are magnificently conceived. But before passing immediately to their consideration, it is necessary to refer to one part of the explanation of the death of Christ which is extrinsic to the main development of the theory. Due to his necessarily pre-Darwinian and pre-critical outlook, Campbell thinks of human death as "the wages of sin."³ He thinks Christ was in sympathy with this penalty. Just as Christ acknowledged God's righteousness in condemning sin, Christ also acknowledged by his death the righteousness of God's judgment which brought death upon man. As a true brother to man, Christ shared in the experience of death with him, thereby acknowledging God's judgment while at the same time showing the power in humanity which can triumph over death. Though Christ is conceived to

1- page 164.

2- page 195.

3- Also Dr. Denney, "The Atonement and the Modern Mind" pp. 90-107.

acknowledge that "the wages of sin" which is death, is a righteous judgment, this is far from being all that Campbell observes in Christ's death. The element here described is not necessary to his main thought on the subject. In fact, just before he introduces this material, he remarks, "I have nothing to add in direct elucidation of the view now taken of the nature of the atonement."¹ His central thought has gone before. And what we are now about to discuss in connection with Christ's sufferings, is absolutely essential to the theory.

It would be folly to gainsay the reality of physical suffering in Christ's last agonizing hours. But the suffering simply as such would have "no virtue to accomplish any spiritual development in men, no virtue to impart a true knowledge of sin or to raise the spirits of men into the light of what our sins are in the sight of God..."² The spiritual factors involved shine as light for us.

Campbell thinks it would have been possible for Christ to have stepped from under the weight of the Cross and called for divine interference, but Christ saw that love must take its course, that evil is not to be overcome by divine interference, and that in conflict with evil, love will ultimately triumph. Therefore, we see as one phase of Christ's suffering, "a power of evil permitted to have its course" in its battle to overcome love. And no one of Christ's followers is exempt from such suffering. Jesus taught his disciples the place of suffering in their lives. "If any man will come after me, let

1 - page 255.

2 -page 219

him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me..."

In Christ's last suffering, "the continuity of the life of sonship is unbroken..", and our interest in it is unaltered. "We are to meditate on the details of our Lord's sufferings with that personal reference to ourselves, and therefore with that expectation of light as to their nature which is justified by the words, "Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptised with the baptism that I am baptised with,"¹ And in this, if we ponder it well, we see "something of the depth of our calling as a call to fellowship in Christ's suffering."

It is true that up to the time of these final sufferings of Christ, his life had already shown a loving trust in the Father and a forgiveness towards men. "But the extent to which sonship could trust the Father, and the extent to which the true brother could exercise forgiving love had to be further manifested." Love needed to be thoroughly exposed to wickedness. Christ did not stop short of the Cross, but in going to the uttermost he has at one and the same time given us "a measure of man's rejection of God," and "of the forgiving love of Him who could die for his enemies." We must find this in the Cross if it is to be to us a revealing of the Father through the power of the life of sonship.

The forgiving love of Christ was put to severe trial on the Cross, yet his mind of love toward man did not fail to express itself even then. Christ's prayer, "Father forgive them for they know not what they do", is the perfection of his prayer for us. Without these final hours of suffering, Christ could not have shown forth so well "in human consciousness ...

the forgiveness that is in love; nor the strength to overcome evil with good which brotherly love can exercise, sustained by the faith of sonship trusting in the love of the Father; or the sufficiency that is in the Father's favour for the life of sonship however absolutely cast upon God.¹ And this has significance for us. "It is this same love as in us through participation in him as our life that we are called to manifest, and for the development of which in us, it may be the Father's will that we shall have a personal experience of drinking of our Lord's cup and being baptized with his baptism... which if it comes to us, we without this light, are ill prepared to welcome." We are called to the fellowship of this phase of the Cross, to the fellowship "of his love to those who crucified him, of that love as in itself the deepest capacity of suffering, proving its fountain to be in God by being forgiving love." "Such a victory of love" is "what Christ is daily~~ing~~ calling us to prove in measure in calling us to take up our cross daily and follow him."²

Not only was this final suffering the completest fulfillment of the spirit of brotherhood to men, but it was the perfected expression of the life of sonship in its relation to the Father. In view of what the whole manner of Christ's life has revealed, Campbell is necessitated to believe that in all his sufferings, Christ was abiding in an unbroken sense of trust in the Father. Campbell cannot admit any element which would seem to mar Christ's consciousness of oneness with the

Father. For anything of this sort "we should feel quite unprepared." Christ must have anticipated the trial in the spirit of the words, "I am not alone, because the Father is with me."

Therefore, in these moments, when evil was taking its course, we can do no other than expect that now of all times the might of eternal life presented to our faith in the Son of God, would remain firm, and that there would be brought into view the triumph of faith in God. Christ was made equal for what he had to bear by faith in the Father. Christ was not sustained by an objective or external "might of power at all", but by the might whose "only strength was the strength of faith"¹ This does not minimise his suffering; it makes it real to us. It was a bitter cup of suffering as Christ saw men reject him. His soul must have burned within him as he observed men so zealously strive to blow out the very light of life to them.

Campbell being unable to admit any break in Christ's consciousness of oneness with the Father, is faced with a problem. He is confronted with the exclamation from the Cross occurring in the first two gospels, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken me." Campbell does not accept this as a final declaration of despair; as the utterance of a faith that has lost touch with God. Of course the traditional explanation that this despair is part of a punishment suffered for sin, is thrown out altogether. Campbell will not let go his firm belief that love and faith triumphed in the final trial of faith on the Cross. The manner of justifying this intense conviction is

an interesting one.

The cry on the Cross is from the twenty second Psalm. It is evident, thinks Campbell, that Christ had this Psalm in mind, and so was thoroughly aware of the context of the Psalm. The context sheds light on every part. It is a Psalm which opens in agony of spirit, in anguish of heart. A soul is bowed with bitter experience and voices the feeling that God has forsaken it, yet having thus unburdened itself before God, it runs forward to a strong faith, a glorious hope in God. The suffering of spirit with which the Psalm opens is upheld and sustained by a sure trust, by a faith that, "All the ends of the earth shall remember and turn unto the Lord, And all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before Thee. For the Kingdom is the Lord's, And he is ruler over the nations."¹ And the Psalmist who felt that God was momentarily out of reach, raises his voice in thankfulness that God hath not hid his face from him, "But when he cried unto Him, He heard." Campbell, therefore, accepts the cry from the Cross only in the light of this setting.² This interpretation is in harmony with Campbell's understanding of the mind of Christ, while at the same time it is appropriate to the account in Luke where Christ is reported to have said, "Father into thy hands I commend my spirit." This Campbell finds more congenial to his view.

"The simplest positive idea which I am able to form of the glory given to the Father, in saying, in death, 'Father into thy hands I commend my spirit', I receive

1 - Psalm 22.

2 - This explanation has been advanced also by T.V.Tymms, "The Christian Idea of Atonement", pp. 290-293, Angus Lectures 1903.

in realising the nakedness of simple being, stripped of all possession but what is possessed in the heart of the Father, which is suggested to us as that in the consciousness of which this trust is exercised. It is the most perfect and absolute form of that experience, 'I am not alone, for the Father is with me.' It takes away creation and leaves but God. It is not difficult to see the glory given to God in this faith. Never does the Son who dwells in the bosom of the Father, utter more to our hearts what it is to possess the Father as our Father, and to be sons of God, than when He says in death, 'Father into thy hands I commend my spirit.'¹

We must share in the mind expressed in the words, "Father into thy hands I commend my spirit." We too can share in that attitude through Christ. The strength of the indwelling spirit of God was the victory of the Son of God over the world, and it was his victorious peace in death. Having this mind in us, we too can meet life and death, and be crucified with Christ.

In the Cross then, we have a triumph of faith in which there was also an anticipated result, "And I if I be lifted up I will draw all men unto me." There is for us every reason to abide in the belief that in the last trying hours, Christ held "fast the beginning of his confidence," and was "sustained by the simple faith in that original fatherliness of the Father's heart, which he had come forth to reveal and to reveal by
²
trusting it." Christ is seen "trusting in that Name alone when brought in the extremest need of a sure hold of God, trusting simply in God..." He rested secure in "that Name which he had come to reveal to sinners, that they might also trust in it and be saved, and the Father's response to that trust is preached as the gospel to the chief of sinners." It

1 - page 258.

2 - p244. Campbell emphasises this sentence by italics and capitals.

strengthens our faith that Christ was faithful. We see in it, "the simple nature of trust in God as the response of sonship to the heart of the Father apprehended by faith."¹

The Cross then is the crowning moment of the atonement. As the spectral colours combine in the light of the sun, so on the Cross the elements of the atonement shine forth in one great brilliance. All the atoning work of Christ is here fused into one burning moment. The whole of that life converges on Calvary and is focused on the Cross. It is to be the power of our lives, for we are related to it as Christian beings, related to the atonement with divine naturalness.

Christianity must be the natural development of the atoning work of Christ. "The fitness of all the elements that have now been recognised as present in the personal consciousness of Christ in humanity to enter into the experience of Christians, to be the elements of their lives must have been commending itself to the reader as we have proceeded."² These elements shining in us by faith shall "reproduce themselves in us according to the measure of our faith." The atonement thus, through faith reproduces its spirit in us.

"Let our minds rest on this unity between the atonement and Christianity." "How natural a sequel to the atonement is Christianity thus seen to be. Christ's work shared in through being trusted to, or rather trusted to with a trust which is of necessity a sharing in it." "...a trust in the work of Christ is in its ultimate reference, trust in that fatherly heart of God which that work reveals, and such trust is the pulse and

breath of our new life; the life of sonship."¹

Christ as our example dismisses all ideas of substitution. How could we on such a view, "attempt to follow Christ as an example in relation to his inner life, the springs of his action, the conscious rightness of his righteousness; his conscious confidence towards God, his walk with God?"

"Therefore in the true conception of this matter there is no practical difficulty; Christ's righteousness as a form of the law of the spirit of life that was in him, being, in the strictest and most absolute sense, an example for us who have the life of sonship in him, and in whom the righteousness of the law is to be fulfilled in our walking in his Spirit."²

Objections may arise in connection with the use of the word "example". The concept as here employed is not expected to lower our conceptions of God, but rather "to raise our conceptions to that to which God calls man..." The use of the word is not intended to suggest independence on our part, as though we were individually to be each another Christ. The way of the Cross has been revealed to mankind. That stands unique and there is to be no duplication of that which Christ accomplished. He is the vine and we are the branches, and yet he is our example in a very real sense. He calls to us to take up our cross and follow him. We are to become clothed with his spirit and walk as he walked. With great discernment Campbell has said, "the atonement as now presented, if it has been a form which the eternal life took in Christ, a form determined by the nature of that life and the circumstances in which it was developed, then in the measure in which we partake in that eternal life, we **shall** partake in the atonement, and

1 - page 278.

2 - page 280.

have it reproduced in us", though not with equal consciousness. This is not lowering the divine; it is exalting our conception of Christianity. Therefore the expression, "example" should be a welcome conception. Campbell reminds us of the dignity that may belong to example by recalling the exhortation, "Be ye perfect even as your Father in heaven is perfect."

Conclusion

Campbell's theory of the atonement is now before us. He thinks of it as having a unity and simplicity and naturalness in itself and as related to us, which is compelling. Yet at the same time, Campbell recognises that behind and around the sphere in which we have been moving, there are many unexplained problems. We have seen what shines to us in the work of Christ, but understand completely God's relation to the world we cannot. We do not shrink from the mystery of unsolved problems, for all deep thinking on the questions of our existence involves mystery.

Campbell admits his inability to explain precisely the "nature" of the spiritual forces which play upon us, or the "manner" in which the fact is accomplished. It is to be known by us "only in its results." We are related to Christ spiritually; we know by the results which his life has had upon our spiritual life. Though Campbell expresses himself frequently in the language of mystical union with Christ, he is ready to confess that the nature and the relation is not altogether plain. When we live to God we may say, "Yet not I, but Christ

liveth in me." But the faith so expressed "has in it the deepest mystery; but it is mystery in the region in which we are prepared for mystery, being, first in the manner and being of God, and then where the line of meeting is between God and man."¹

This is one of the remarkable things about Campbell. He reaches as far as his plummet will take him, but he refuses to express with certainty what is beyond. When Campbell admits his inability to fathom the precise manner in which the divine touches the human, he is really no worse off than modern religious psychology. It is a mooted question and there is much debate as to whether the influence is a moral influence or a spiritual influence. The Christian consciousness speaks in terms of spiritual influence without being able to define the process exactly. But it appears that some who explain this relation as a moral influence are really trying to find a way to explain the spiritual influence in order to bring it within the realm of understanding.

Campbell is constrained to think that there is somewhere a boundary line between light and darkness, but he does not pretend to know where it is, and further, there is no reason why we should draw that line closer to us than is absolutely necessary. If that boundary exists, Campbell leaves it out somewhere in uncharted space. But in this study of the atonement he has done his utmost to concern himself with those factors which seemed to shine from the work of Christ itself. "The aspect in which the atonement has now been contemplated

does not belong to the proper region of mystery at all."

There are some ultimate questions which lie hidden, such as God's purposes in creation, but says Campbell, "I have now considered the elements of the work of Christ as what his participation in humanity, and our participation in the divine nature through him, seemed to place within the limit of the light of life that shines for us in him."¹

Meditation on the person and work of Christ presented to our faith, leads us up to the belief in his divinity. Divinity shines forth from all that he accomplished and it impels us to acknowledge it as such. Viewing the atonement from this point of vantage and looking back upon it, a new reverence for it comes upon us. There are many who do not see the necessity for carrying this further, but Campbell goes on to the belief in the eternal existence of the Son with the Father. The Father was in the Son and the Son in the Father, and in the depths of the Christian consciousness we contemplate them as one, in whom also we live and move and have our being. And here we are face to face with mystery, the mystery of our own existence and the mystery "of the contradiction between what man is and what God wills him to be."

Campbell will not solve this contradiction by thinking of it as but an apparent anomaly. Despite the feeling that we

1 - page 321. cf. Sabatier, "As to the ultimate metaphysical problems which lie behind the atonement, "we find no reply that satisfies us." "For my own part I stop, I confess, at the point beyond which the solid ground slips from under one's feet, and I reply with Jesus, 'Even so Father, because so has it seemed good in Thy sight.'" p. 222, article of Auguste Sabatier in "Modern Theories of the Atonement", a Theological Symposium.

have our being in God, there is the antinomy which faces the Christian, e.g. the fact of sin. Some would remove the difficulty by saying that the contradiction is only apparent, that nothing is or can be other than what God wills. "Hatred may believe this but love cannot."

"Self may believe that there is an end present to the divine mind which all moral events (good or bad) equally and necessarily subserve, and with reference to which it is that God wills them to be, and which it may call the divine glory. But love cannot believe that the divine glory is of this nature, or that that will, in respect of which God is love, and the manifestation of which must be His glory, can, in respect of moral beings, be fulfilled but in their loving."¹

But in any case, these philosophical problems do not stand as previous questions which must first be solved before we can see the light which is in Christ. The atonement is surrounded by difficulties which, however, are external to what it is in itself, but if we understand the atonement, we will have the clearest light in which to approach ultimate problems. Campbell, therefore, has centred his interest in the nature of the atonement, and no one would deny that he has seen a great light.

"I have written...as a man communing with his brother man, and giving utterance to the deep conviction of his own heart as to the spiritual need of humanity and the common salvation. For I have written as seeming to myself to hear, and as desiring to be used to help others to hear with personal and practical application, the Son of God saying to us, 'I am the way, the truth and the life, no man cometh unto the Father but by me'; and the Father as saying to us, 'This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased, hear ye him.'"

- 1 - page 326.
- 2 - page 329

Chapter VII

E s t i m a t e

Problems centring about the person of Christ do not appear in the development of the theory itself. There is no discussion in the body of the exposition of difficulties concerning Christ's person. It is obvious that at no time is Campbell greatly taken up with questions about Christ which go outside the range of intelligibility. His purpose in the theory is to combine reason and revelation in a comprehensible view. And as he says, the atonement has been considered by him as an occurrence in humanity which contemplated certain results or ends to be attained in man. The attainment of these ends would come about by the effect of Christ's work upon the spirits of men, just because man himself is able to participate in the elements of that atonement.¹ This is plainly a subjective force, and it places a moral responsibility upon men to respond to it.

But Campbell does not let the matter rest altogether at this point. There may be a further mystical relation; Campbell thinks there is, and he admits that this confronts him with a mystery he cannot solve.² Obviously he is thinking in terms of an exalted Christ. Though Campbell is very sure that the effect of Christ's work upon us is the power of the facts presented to us in Christ's life and death to awaken our

1.p.192.

2.p.322.

moral natures, yet he also believes in an exalted Christ. But Campbell cannot bring himself to suggest what the relation can possibly be now between the exalted Christ and the believer. He very properly leaves it out of account in developing his theory, an aim of which has been to make Christ intelligible for human life, all the while admitting the inability to exhaust the subject or solve many of its ultimate problems. Certainly this aim has, on the whole, been well fulfilled, for the theory is explicit and reasonable and makes a valid appeal to faith.

We can say without hesitation that in the development of his position, Campbell has ruled out the atonement as an objective transaction. The process of our being saved is a subjective one and we may call this moral and we may call it spiritual, for the two can mean the same thing. Campbell calls his theory moral and spiritual. He believed the atonement "to be the most constraining moral power to make every man trust in God..."¹

Is not the moral influence which comes from the Cross that which gives us the spiritual stimulus to commune with God? Does not the life of Christ and the Cross effect tremendously our moral nature, and awaken within us the well springs of the spiritual life which then flow out toward God? This is what our religious practice is. Moral stimulus does not need to mean a mere impetus to moral action apart from a religious relation. It should be repudiated if it means only that. Limited in this wise, a moral view would be an attitude entirely

1. Norman Macleod's characterization of Campbell's theory, Good Words, vol. for 1872.

antithetic to Christ. Unless Jesus' influence impels us to seek communion with the God and Father of Jesus, his atonement is not being fulfilled in us. That which gives to the work of Christ its meaning is our participation with him in the life of love, the life of filial oneness with God.

We must think of our relation to Christ in a natural, intelligible way, and Campbell's service in this respect gives him a place of eminence in theology. As to our relation to Christ, we need to have some intellectual light, something which can commend itself to our consciences. Unless we can plainly say that it is the presentation of Christ to men which quickens their dormant moral or spiritual nature, we are simply outside of having any understanding of the matter. We should be able to admit without pretense that in a normal manner, the presentation of the divine love displayed in Christ and offered to conscious selves, must by what it is in itself, awaken a natural response in these conscious moral beings. Is not this the manner in which God in Christ is striving to reconcile the world unto Himself? Do our ethical and religious requirements need more than an atonement which shall so effect our moral nature, our spiritual being, that the responsible self will be stimulated to seek communion and fellowship with God in the spirit of Christ? If we cannot admit this, the only alternative is some refined form of election through spiritual agencies, the influence of which will come to us by channels other than that of our conscious moral responsibility. From this last we shrink. As Campbell stated it, the will of God revealed to us in Christ, "must reconcile us to itself by the

power of what it is or not at all."¹ And this must be presented to conscious moral beings for their choice. Time and again Campbell stressed the moral responsibility involved in accepting the Christian faith. Responsibility can be genuine only where there is a genuine presentation to the conscious self.²

All the implications of Campbell's position are opposed to unnatural and unintelligible explanations of the relation between Christ and man. Occasionally the language of mystical union breaks through, but it is never developed in a form in which the individual is submerged. This language of religion the Christian can feel to be somehow true without losing any of the rich moral and spiritual content of an intellectually satisfying view of the work of Christ.

However, there are two criticisms which we must make if the intellectual clarity at which Campbell aimed is to be arrived at. The first of these is as to the retention of Christ's pre-existence, which many will no doubt regard as a most excellent retention. But we are driven to doubt the worth of this idea.

It is to be observed that Campbell provides no discussion of this question, so that we do not know how he conceives of such pre-existence, whether Christ existed as idea in the divine mind or as coexisting with God from the beginning. Of the nature of the pre-existence nothing is said, but it is assumed without definition. If by pre-existence we have in mind the desirable suggestion that the longsuffering love of God manifested in Christ is eternal, so that what we see in Christ is

1. p.293. 2. This is strongly emphasized in Campbell's "Christ the Bread of Life," p.8ff, p.90ff.

without beginning because eternally in or of God, there can be no objection. However, the term preëxistence seems to create sooner or later, the suggestion that the historic Jesus was preëxistent, or at all events that his personal consciousness preëxisted. Preëxistence, if it is taken to mean what it is generally intended to mean, does not stop short of regarding Christ as having had a conscious personal existence prior to his dateable advent. This seems to be Campbell's conception of it in so far as he uses it at all.

Fundamental to Campbell's theory is the reality of Christ's humanity, and also the fact of his life as a genuine development in humanity. Our principle objection to the assertion of preëxistence is that it rules out the life of development in humanity, that development by which the human is made partaker of the divine nature. In what way can we with any semblance of reality actually entertain the idea of Christ's humanity and divinity? We have already used the analogy from human experience by which the human consciousness is conceived of as being conformed to the will of God and made partaker of the divine nature. We accept this analogy as a help, and if it has any reality at all, it excludes the idea of Christ as preëxistent personality. If we must hold to preëxistence, how can we with consistency speak of Christ's consciousness as human while divine, a development in humanity? Either the consciousness of the historic Jesus was a human consciousness, in time, so fully partaking of the divine nature as to be the logos, the word or wisdom of God made flesh, the mind or will of God in divinely elevated humanity, or it was a preëxistent conscious-

ness having substantial qualities of mind from the beginning.

In either of the above alternatives there is mystery enough, room for baffling problems, yet in the interests of an intelligible theory of the atonement, it ought not to be difficult to decide which of the two is preferable. If the first is our view, we can with some degree of genuineness think of Christ as our brother, one with us, though exalted above us. We have some analogy in our own experience for comprehending the meaning of growing from more to more, of being conformed to the will of God in the hope that we may grow up into the stature and manhood of Jesus Christ. On the first view then we get real help from Christ's life in humanity, his unfailing trust in God and unflinching loyalty to his mission.

On the second view, the help we can get from Christ's life is less real and natural. His life can hardly be said to be a development in humanity, for his consciousness must then have been a complete divine consciousness from the beginning. The idea of preexistence seems incompatible with his childhood and development. Of course it is impossible to explain the fact of Christ existing as and when he did on either view, but the first line of thought offered here makes Christ more certainly our elder brother, while it surely makes him no less divine.

Why try to explain our inability to account for Christ's appearance by pushing him back into a mysterious preexistence? It is sufficient mystery that Christ appeared as and when he did without bringing in explanations which serve only to put him further from us. Such explanations make it more difficult for us to grasp intelligently how the divine and human are joined.

If we retain the analogy that has been suggested, we have at least some measure of light in understanding Christ without exhausting the mystery of his appearance. But if we bring in preëxistence, then the whole question of the development and growth of Christ's personality belongs to a sphere quite out of touch with our own. We see no call to introduce these added difficulties.

The two views appear to us as separate, distinct and inharmonious. We may think we can hold the two, but when set over against each other, they do not go hand in hand. We may theoretically maintain preëxistence, but if we examine our practical habit of mind as to the help we get through Christ, we tend to think in terms which make preëxistence unnecessary.¹

Campbell did retain preëxistence. However, in the whole development of his theory, the idea plays no noticeable part. Naturally it would not, for in analyzing the work of Christ, the concept of preëxistence is not required. The author's stream of thought is not affected by the idea. Campbell is dealing with the development of the life of love in humanity. He emphasizes the humanity of Christ, recognizing, nevertheless, incarnate love, God in man, and the whole theory runs forward without the need at all for preëxistence, resting the foundation of the atonement ultimately in God. Considering Campbell's dependence on the Fourth Gospel, and the importance of this conception in traditional theology, it is strange that he did

1. Rashdall points out that 'preëxistence' in its customary theological use, is out of harmony with the earliest doctrine of the church. "The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology", Hastings Rashdall, p.444.

not make more of it.

Having made an adverse review of preëxistence, we pass to the second criticism. We have been admitting that Campbell regarded the life of Christ as the development of incarnate love in humanity. Despite all that Campbell says in this particular, he hardly dares to mean what he says. In following the life of Christ from stage to stage toward the Cross, Campbell feels that he is dealing with exalted humanity, but he would like to make a distinction between a development in humanity, and a development of humanity. In one of his letters to his eldest son, reference is made to Ewald's History of Israel, where in dealing with the "Life of Christ", Ewald speaks of the Incarnation. Campbell objects to the Incarnation as meaning "adde-velopment of humanity";¹ so that therefore, the constant use of the phrase, "development in humanity" is less natural and less human than at first sight appears. This is but an application of the idea of preëxistence, and is an illustration of how preëxistence tends to make its follower adopt language which introduces too much separation between Christ and ourselves. It involves a certain amount of mental reservation which dims the humanity of Jesus.

Whatever the distinction intended, it can hardly have much meaning for us in view of Campbell's insistence on the humanity of Christ. In emphasizing this side of Christ, as he does, it is manifest that his purpose is to bring Christ into our mental and spiritual range. And he has done so, yet having done so, he is, as it were, afraid of his achievement. We regret the distinction which Campbell seems desirous of making.

1. ~~Memorials~~ ^{Memorials}, vol. II, p. 235.

In so far as Campbell regards the development in humanity as different from its natural meaning, we consider it inconsistent with the insistence on Christ's real humanity so strenuously advocated in "The Nature of the Atonement."

For our part we can feel that the criticisms which have now been made, if followed out, would fulfil the aim of the theory, e.g. to make the work of Christ as intelligible as the interests of faith will allow. But no doubt there are many who feel, not only able, but desirous of retaining these phases of the atonement. In that case, instead of drawing a line between them, it might be better to accept the situation as a roadway upon which all may stand, all sure that, regardless of the side of the road on which we find ourselves, we can be certain that it is in the face of Jesus Christ that the glory of God shines forth to us.

Campbell has made a noteworthy achievement. We have been constantly struck by the undeviating movement of his mind in developing his theory of the life of love lived in humanity, and all this with no knowledge of historical criticism during the period when his great work was done. Campbell moves with smooth step in unfolding his view of the Incarnate life without violating the ethical conscience, remaining ever true to the intention to interpret Christ's life in terms of the love of God to man. Here and there in his book on the atonement, one can find extraneous elements attributable to the limitations of historical knowledge. But these have been consigned by Campbell's intuitive genius to the periphery of his thinking, and do not intrude upon the central theme, as was the case with

Luther.

An examination of some of the best modern writings on the atonement reveals the fact that in essential features very little has been added to the conclusions at which Campbell arrived in 1856,¹ while much in some of these writings is below Campbell's level. Naturally there have been varieties of treatment and fresh angles of approach and differing degrees of emphasis, but the moral and spiritual elements which Campbell perceived in the work of Christ, must still belong to any enlightened theory of the nature of the atonement. These elements can be very briefly summarized.

The retrospective and prospective, or negative and positive aspects of the atonement have never been more appreciated than in the present theory. The writer well knew the fact of sin and evil from which we need to be saved, while he understood also the open way into a more positive relation of actually living in filial communion with God. Christ is not the Saviour merely because he keeps us from doing evil, but because through him we are able increasingly to be and act as sons of God. Instead of seeing humanity totally depraved, Campbell regarded the innate, if dormant, capacity for sonship as inherent in humanity. Humanity was in sin, but even so, it was nevertheless, groping in the darkness, and knew not the light which could lead to God. The revelation of this way into God's radiant presence was brought by Jesus, sent by a God of love.

1. "...There is small exaggeration in saying that since his time no British thinker who has not sat at his feet has been able to write rewardingly on the deepest problems of the Cross."-
'Some Aspects of Christian Belief', Professor H.R. Mackintosh, p81

Men needed to know what the character and love of God were.

They did not know their relation to God as spiritual beings with a capacity for sonship. But now they have come to know God is their Father and desires filial oneness with them. And that alone is what they need to know; they need to have the character and love of God revealed to them, which, by its very nature, reveals what sin means to God. The knowledge of the love and character of God is the cauterizing shaft which cleanses sin from human life. Men now discovered that their God and Father was a God of love who desired their return ~~through~~ the natural influence of His love upon them. He did not need to be propitiated, He was always gracious. God's love was not blind to our sin, but love rose above and beyond it in the desire to bring us unto Himself in holiness of mind and heart.

Jesus was the chosen one of God to bear these glad tidings of salvation, and we recognize this through what he taught, and especially by what he was.¹ We see in him this perfected sonship toward God, and perfected brotherhood toward man. He is an embodiment of the highest ethical and spiritual ideal and what more can divinity be?² He speaks of love and is its living symbol. He speaks of God's character, and reveals it in himself. He is a living witness of divinity, and in him we know,

1. In discussing the depth of meaning implied in Christ's teaching men to pray for those who despitefully use them, Campbell said, "How do such precepts as that... reveal the divinity of our divine Teacher beyond all miracles!" Mem. vol. II, p. 84, cf Rashdall's 'Idea of Atonement' p. 457. 2. "Men have tried to exalt Christ by ascribing to him all manner of metaphysical characteristics and power; but that which the gospels place in the forefront of their portraiture is just this moral completeness, this perfectly filial consciousness, this stainless, untainted holiness". p. 290, "The Christian Doctrine of Salvation". Stevens.

therefore, that none other than the eternal God is communicating Himself to us. And as Campbell so well maintained, the identity we recognize here between Christ and God is identity of will and purpose; "Lo I come to do Thy will O God." His whole history is the development of this incarnate will of God.

Furthermore, a most penetrating wisdom perceived the necessity for suffering in connection with this revelation of God. The sufferings of Christ did not present themselves to Campbell as something to get over, something for which apology is due. He recognized these sufferings as the necessary expression of what holy love must suffer because of sin,¹ and that the final suffering on the Cross was the supreme sacrifice which love had to make in order to remain faithful to the course which that love had chosen. Christ could not allow an impending death to swerve him from the completest devotion to his divine task. Campbell has specifically indicated as his view, that as Christ faced the burden of the Cross, he came to see it as in conformity to the will of God and that therefore, there must be no interference in the course which love must take in overcoming evil. So at the Cross, love and evil stand revealed. The apparent victory of evil was, in fact, its most fatal blow. The loss which love sustained was its greatest triumph; "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me."

1. "It costs something to the doctor to heal a patient; more for a scholar to teach an ignoramus; most of all for a holy soul to cleanse an unholy one and give life to one that is dead....The passion of Christ tells the world what sin is, for it tells us how a sinful world treats perfect love. It tells us what love is, for it tells us what the Divine love is willing to suffer for a sinful world." Lyman Abbott in 'Theological Symposium on the Atonement, 1900', p. 100-101.

Moreover, the relation to us of Christ's suffering for our sins is clearly discerned. Mental anguish and physical suffering came in the course of love's manifestation. They reveal the vicarious principle wrought into the very frame of the moral universe, and into the fellowship of which every disciple of Christ must find his way. Mankind is purified through fellowship in that suffering, by being identified with that divine will in reference to sin made visible in Jesus. This is the atonement, and while it condemns, it also purifies.

Salvation, therefore, is a question of fellowship, of active sonship, for, as Campbell indicated, the elements of the atonement are to be reproduced in us. And this process is continuous in the life of the world. The atonement is an eternal process, and in recognizing this, Campbell has the highest claim on our respect. That which Christ felt because of sin, is what God always suffers because of human waywardness.¹ Christ raised us to an apprehension of what our sin is to God who is ever yearning for our return. God can never be satisfied until the atoning way revealed by Christ has been realized in us.

This seems to involve universalism. It is a very inviting position from many points of view. However, Campbell could not quite bring himself to make the affirmation. He may have thought that the declaration of it would have a tendency to diminish somewhat the necessary impression of the awfulness of sin, which men should have. He did think it interfered

1. There is "a cross in God's perfection from eternity...", Bushnell, 'Vicarious Sacrifice', p.73.

with man's freedom, and in consequence he could not go the length of asserting universalism. In this respect he differed from his friend Erskine. In a letter to the Bishop of London, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, Bishop Ewing writes, "We have just had a three days' visit from Mr. Campbell of Row. He certainly lives in a region whose sun is as the light of seven days. He differs from Mr. Erskine in one respect, feeling it possible that a free human will may eternally escape the Divine longings, which Erskine thinks incredible..."¹ But Campbell had an open mind on the matter. In a letter to his eldest son, he thankfully acknowledges "that it is a question which so many good men are feeling to be an open one; while of the two directions of thought (in reaction against the popular creed here), in one or other of which men are going, I feel that both as a Scriptural question, and as one of Christian philosophy, the conception of final restitution commends itself incomparably more to me than that of annihilation, which I understand many Nonconformists as well as some in the church are accepting."²

In the elements of the atonement which have now been briefly summarized, no reference was made to the Holy Spirit. Moberly has criticized Campbell for leaving out such a discussion. It would have been well had Campbell given us his own specific statement on the subject. He may have left it out intentionally. However, the word Spirit is used, but in so far as it is applied, the impression is left that the Holy

1. Memoir of Alexander Ewing, Bishop of Argyll and the Isles, by A.J. Ross, p.448. The date of the above letter is April 24. 1866, being thus but a few years before Campbell's death in 1872.
2. Memorials. vol. II, p.295.

Spirit means the Spirit which is God. In writing his book on the atonement, Campbell laboured in a spiritual atmosphere of reality, and strove with great effort to produce a reasonable and clarified view. He has given us what was central in his own experience. So far as his actual experience is concerned, he thought and wrote as though that which is Spirit is the Holy Spirit, which is God.

The elements which Campbell has included in his masterly treatment of his great subject, belong to its very nature. Modern writings bear further testimony to this fact, by including them also. We regard Campbell's position as superior to that of his contemporaries. In some important respects Maurice and Campbell have much in common, but Campbell himself criticized Maurice for the superficial character ascribed to the sense of guilt in man. Campbell's objection would apply to what is also a significant feature of Ritschl's position, e.g. the tendency to believe there is nothing real in the nature of things, answering to our sense of guilt. "The sense of guilt becomes a mistake which further knowledge removes. All sin is thus reduced to ignorance."¹

We regard it a really great achievement that Campbell was able by his unaided and independent effort to produce the view of the atonement here developed. It is sometimes stated that he was dependent upon Erskine, whose views he expanded. Pfleiderer and Principal Tulloch make this suggestion which is a natural supposition, for Erskine was the older of these two

1. From conversation of Campbell with Principal Shairp, Mem. vol. II, p. 343.

very intimate friends. Interchange of thought there was, to be sure, but the friendship began in the Row days, when Erskine, on hearing Campbell preach, declared, "I have heard to-day from ~~that~~ pulpit what I believe to be the true gospel." A lifelong friendship followed, but their theological conclusions were reached along separate lines - Campbell's on the whole by complete analysis of problems; Erskine's by ready assent to new thoughts. This view of the independent character of the work of each is supported by the Contemporary Review, and by Dr. Leckie in the Expositor.¹ Furthermore, there was no consciousness on Campbell's part of indebtedness to Erskine. In fact Campbell found it frequently necessary to restrain Erskine, by showing him the intellectual difficulties involved in some new born idea which Erskine was ready to espouse with enthusiasm.

Campbell's contribution is in a very real sense his own. His work on the atonement is an interpretation of Christianity, and in his day was really new in British theology, and was in many ways superior to the contemporary work of Schleiermacher and Ritschl. It is not a complete theological whole, a system fully formulated, but it is the very marrow around which a theology should construct itself. Campbell interpreted Jesus in terms of a vital religious faith, and in such a manner as to impel ethical assent. A philosophy of religion or theology must begin, as Campbell emphasized, with the revelation which Christ affords us, and for that reason he gave of his best to understand the meaning of Christ for human life. Theology which did not begin with Christ, but simply included him, gave

1. Contemporary Review June 1878, and Expositor, May 1923.

him a place as it were in the system, was discountenanced. Christ and the Christian and the facts of the Christian life - in the light of these must theology develop. Did Campbell not say that it is thus, from divine facts to the laws of the Kingdom of God that we must take our way? Though he did not give us a complete theological system, Campbell did provide that which is most essential for theology, e.g., a Christian interpretation of Christ.

Superiority to Schleiermacher

In respect to this contribution of Campbell, there is a difference in approach and emphasis from that of Schleiermacher his contemporary, who died a few years after Campbell's heresy trial. One cannot avoid the impression in reading Schleiermacher, that he is striving to force a philosophy into a Christian mold without having completely succeeded. We do not think Schleiermacher understood the nature of religion nor the work of Christ with the same clear insight that was Campbell's. Naturally there are many similarities between the two, but there are certain fundamental differences which ^affect the whole Christian outlook. A detailed comparison is not called for, though such a comparison would show some remarkable affinities in the explanation of the work of Christ.

Despite the necessary recognition that must be conceded to Schleiermacher for his great contribution, especially as the stimulating forerunner of much of the modern theology, it is nevertheless necessary to call attention to the independent work of Campbell, which in several ways supersedes that of

Schleiermacher.

With reference to the work of Christ, Schleiermacher unquestionably introduced a moral atmosphere and gave no room for legal theories of punishment or imputation. He clearly saw the unethical character of the forensic schemes, and they have no place in his theology. Yet, when we actually try to form a contact with the Christ of the Glaubenslehre, we feel that we are in touch with a metaphysical concept rather than with the person of the divine Son himself. And further, the relation of Christ to man and man's sin is not what the Christian conscience knows it to be.

Schleiermacher does not seem to appreciate the Christian abhorrence of sin, nor is there sufficient evidence of an understanding of the manner in which Christ looked upon sin. Schleiermacher does say that Christ's own blessedness consists in freedom from the evils to which flesh is heir, and that this sin is what limits our daily lives. But this is not strong enough. Campbell denounces sin with more vehemence because of a better understanding of its nature. Sin causes divine suffering. Sin is not to be treated softly, but as that which is in itself abhorrent, and which while it exists, causes divine love to suffer. Schleiermacher seems not to have caught the tremendous meaning of sin, nor sufficiently visualized the gulf which sin makes between ourselves and God.

Redemption and reconciliation are not seen in the light of God's great condemnation of sin. The atonement is not, apparently, a marvellous evidence of the long-suffering love of God towards the sons of men. When we read Schleiermacher,

we do not feel ourselves swept by the impact of the love of God to men in their sins, which comes to us from Campbell's pages.

There is sufficient cause for this lack in Schleiermacher. It is due to his general philosophical position. There is a lurking determinism which, where it exists, always exerts a deadening effect on Christian faith. It is held, "that the order in which redemption is actualized in each man, is one with the carrying out of the divine world-order in relation to him."¹ The time when redemption begins in any individual, is that moment in the life of the individual which "must have been the time when he would exercise faith."² This is made to rest in the divine good pleasure and divine fore-knowledge which is concerned with the world whole as its end. The individual is not an end but an element in the whole, and the time when he actually does become converted into the God-consciousness, is, in the light of the unfolding world order, the most suitable for the end in view.

Obviously on this principle a man cannot, consistently, be bowed down for his past sin with deep contrition, for on this maxim, the particular moment which marked conversion is considered to be the most auspicious time when it could have occurred, rather than at some earlier moment in that life. The individual is thus prevented from abhorring his own past sin for his moral responsibility toward it is blunted by the enunciated principle. His past sin could hardly have been different from what it was on this scheme. Campbell explicitly rejected this point of view brought into religion from philosophy

1. 'The Theology of Schleiermacher' Cross, p.242. 2. ibid p.244.

and calls it a "siren song". It makes "the idea of rebellion against the Divine Will a delusion" requiring us to hold, "that we neither have been nor could be other than the necessity of our being determined."¹ Sin in others' lives cannot be expected to stir feelings of deep love for mankind. It is true Schleiermacher does offer the advance of the Kingdom of God, the spread of the God-consciousness as the motive for Christianity's advance, but what is this compared with the motive which arises when sin is seen as God sees it, and when each individual is regarded as an end instead of an unknown quantity in the "world-whole". Christianity desires the individual to be saved at the earliest moment for his own sake, as well as the Kingdom's.

Because of the foregoing lack we really find no atonement in Schleiermacher's theology. We do not find sufficient indication of a recognition that men are orphan children who have lost their way, and that the love of a Father seeks them. The repentance and faith which Schleiermacher includes in conversion do not grip; the source of such efficient repentance he does not realize as coming from the great sympathy and suffering of Christ's life and the Cross. Unless there is a real recognition of sin, and repentance because of it, there is no satisfaction for sin. God's righteousness cannot be satisfied by ignoring sin. Campbell saw this and realized that God could not just intimate his great benevolence and love. We are not to think of God as regarding us as mere ignorant sinners, unavoidable inheritors of an evolutionary past, to be redeemed when the progressive world order or world whole sees fit to include. "Thoughts on Revelation", J.M. Leod Campbell, p.51.

include us. Not that, but in the Christian faith we feel that we have sinned against God, our guilt, and true penitence always feels this. Eliminate it and you subvert the faith which recognises intimate personal relations between the individual and God.

Against Schleiermacher is Campbell's observation that our return to God is not a mere pleasant running forward to accept something that costs God nothing. In that case the gift would be easy to receive because easily given. Instead of this, our sin has been, so to speak, a wound of grief in the heart of God and caused Him to suffer. Though He still loved us, yet our reconciliation could only be a oneness with Him as we shared in His attitude toward sin, and not merely sin in general, but our own. Campbell believed that we must see our sin as Christ sees it, for this is as God sees it, and then acknowledge it in our own hearts before the Father, and this, as we confess it, will be for us a real repentance with a real personal consciousness of guilt. This attitude satisfies God, for there is thus oneness of mind between God and ourselves, and it has come through the crucible of a real contrition.

Schleiermacher does not accord to the sufferings of Christ a primary relation to our salvation. He thinks such a primary place tends to dissociate us from the fellowship of his life prior to death. It is clear of course that he is desirous of escaping theories which concern themselves with the suffering simply as suffering, but his understanding of the suffering is incomplete. He declares that Christ in being sinless is under no obligation to suffer, and that Christ's

perfection does not lie in his sufferings but in his submission to them. However, as Campbell made clear, we are not to think of the divine love in Christ as merely submitting to suffer, but that it was divine love, it could do no other than suffer. Campbell understood the whole meaning of the suffering and its relation to us better than Schleiermacher. He grasps more truly the central meaning of love and God's relation to us as a Father. The world order is too impersonal to Schleiermacher; whereas with Campbell, the meaning of the world order is intelligible only as God is known as a Father related to the spirits of men by love. We are aware that Schleiermacher refers a great deal to Christ, giving him a central place, but there is too little of the work of Christ as leading us into communion with the Father. The feeling of absolute dependence is no satisfactory explanation of communion. It does not begin to exhaust the Christian's relation to the Father.¹

We can understand the lack of full appreciation of Christ's work as opening a way to the Father, for Schleiermacher had his doubts as to this direct way which the Christian consciousness feels it has. Schleiermacher's philosophy was in the way here. We cannot give room to a discussion of his theory of religious knowledge, but we can indicate the central problem of such a discussion, e.g. his vacillation between monism of a

1. In a letter to his son, discussing Browning's 'A Death in the Desert', Campbell refers to the tendency to regard God as unknown in Himself, and to the suggestion that we should nevertheless worship Him, and says, "But such prayer, however it might express the sense of dependence, could not be any going forth of love or of trust felt to be invited; trust and still more love, implying faith in the name of God." Mem. vol. II, p. 132.

pantheistic type, and a dualism in which the universe comes in between God and man. In other words, he holds on the one hand the view that man experiences God directly, but because of the seeming identity of God with the universe, it is pantheism. On the other hand he thinks of God as not immediately experienced, but as working on us through the medium of the universe.¹ Schleiermacher admits that he oscillates between these two basic positions and sees no way out.² Philosophic limitations hemmed in his normal religious demands.³ However near God may be, he is to some ~~some~~ extent out of our immediate reach, for even on his monistic view wherein God is experienced directly, it is only in virtue of pantheism, in which case God can hardly be said to be our rather. And in his attempt to reconcile what seemed to be conflicting aims of religion and philosophy, Schleiermacher missed some of the most important elements in the relation of Christ to men. We think Campbell preserved with greater success, because of a truer insight, the essential elements of the life and work of Christ.

1. "Your feeling is piety in so far as it is the result of the operation of God in you by means of the operation of the world upon you." Schleiermacher's Reden.

2. Section 46 Glaubenslehre; cf also Lichtenberger, History of German Theology in the 19th Century, p.147.

3. Late in life Campbell made his first acquaintance with Schleiermacher, through reading his life and letters. He made this comment; "He thought he was able to co-ordinate his religion and his philosophy, as Jacobi found himself able to do; but I could not but fear that his philosophical difficulty as to the personality of God affected his heart's Godward movements." Campbell felt that Schleiermacher's faith could not sufficiently hear or respond to the love which says, "My son, give me thine heart." Memorials Vol.11, p.202.

Difference Between Campbell and Ritschl

When we turn to Ritschl we are faced with a much more difficult problem. Ritschl corrected Schleiermacher at several points. We have been struck by the high ethical interest which dominates Ritschl, and in this respect he and Campbell have much in common. Campbell's work was finished when Ritschl was a comparatively young man, and when "Justification and Reconciliation" appeared, Campbell had passed away. These men separated by a few short years did a similar work, though unknown to each other.

Like Ritschl, Campbell was primarily interested to conserve the values of the Christian faith, and would concede nothing to philosophy when it ran athwart the faith which the Christian consciousness had found true in experience. Reasonable faith based on experience guided Campbell, and he seems to have been more ready to verify his faith by experience than was the case with Ritschl. If an objection be raised here to the effect that Ritschl demanded an ethical interpretation for the appreciation of Christianity thereby making it objective, our reply must of necessity point to the separation of faith and morals by Ritschl, a matter to be touched upon.

In approaching Ritschl's view of the work of Christ, we must conceive of God as loving will,¹ and through Christ God manifests Himself as such a will. Ritschl has no part in atonement theories which would make God propitious, for he is

1. "Justification and Reconciliation" p.273.

already so. Ritschl refutes juridical schemes and makes God's love paramount. Christ is thought of in terms of personal vocation rather than as filling an official task. He attained his own chief end and in doing so fulfilled the will and purpose of God. His sufferings are not merely borne, but are part of his life, and his death is not to be separated from that life. Christ is conceived of as personality on the analogy of human personality. Thus our ascriptions of divinity grow from a consideration of his life as a complete whole judged by ethical laws. We find divinity in the purpose and will manifest in Christ's life. And as Campbell maintained so also does Ritschl, that the unity between God and Christ is a quality of will which made him at one with God, a partaker in the mind of God. The will of God and Christ are one will. By having made a moral estimate of Christ, of this character, we have furnished ourselves with a criterion which is fundamental for all religious conclusions which we may draw. Ritschl rises also to the idea that the followers of Jesus take rank as sons of God and are received into the relation of sonship which was Christ's.¹ And it is noteworthy that Ritschl has two fundamental ideas which are also basic in Campbell's theory. Campbell rests his atonement on the love of God on the one hand, and man's capacity for sonship on the other. Ritschl does the same thing. Both recognized the gulf between these two conditions which God desired to bridge. However, Campbell diagnosed the separation between man and

1. Justification and Reconciliation, p.386.

gree of Christian insight.

Ritschl's references to Christ just considered the fusion of the two terms Christ and God. Ritschl apparently equated by Ritschl. Garvie apparently element of strength in Ritschl.¹ However, the degree of comprehension in statements of that we as disciples of the Master are to be similar to that which Christ had toward God. We may place the words God and Christ in an analogous place.³ We may speak of Christ in terms of Ritschl does criticize the Greek word for essence,⁴ his verbal construction is not for little. Ritschl says that "the Son of God." We think this contrary to the teaching of Christ himself.

It is to show very much difference between this point, in view of the mental relation made and to which we have referred. Ritschl made a very great practical difference between the two terms, and one would never guess from the Atonement that the terms are identical. Ritschl, however, for all that Christ stand instead of God. Christ is always the mediator between God and man.

Christ's value as God causes an emphasis on the term God. It is no mistake to make them synonymous. It is no

Garvie, p. 267.
 Ritschl, p. 386.
 Ibid. p. 409-411.

God with a finer degree of Christian insight.

In spite of Ritschl's references to Christ just considered, there is too complete fusion of the two terms Christ and God. The terms are constantly equated by Ritschl. Garvie apparently regards this as an element of strength in Ritschl.¹ However, if there is to be any degree of comprehension in statements of the Christian faith that we as disciples of the Master are to have a relation to God similar to that which Christ had toward God,² then we should not place the words God and Christ in an equation as Ritschl does.³ We may speak of Christ in terms of Incarnation, and though Ritschl does criticize the Greek identification of nature and essence,⁴ his verbal construction makes his criticism count for little. Ritschl says that "the community acknowledges Him as God." We think this contrary to the spirit and intention of Christ himself.

It may be difficult to show very much difference between Ritschl and Campbell at this point, in view of the mental reservation which Campbell made and to which we have referred. But the fact remains that Campbell made a very great practical difference between the two terms, and one would never guess from a study of the 'Nature of the Atonement' that the terms Christ and God were identical. Ritschl, however, for all practical purposes makes Christ stand instead of God. Christ has the value of God for us. He is always the mediator between God and ourselves. Christ's value as God causes an interchange of terms which makes them synonymous. It is no

1. The Ritschlian Theology, Garvie, p. 267.

2. Justification and Reconciliation, p. 386.

3. Ibid. p. 483.

4. Ibid. p. 409-411.

doubt with this conception in mind that Garvie attempts to exempt Ritschl from the charge that he eliminates direct communion with God.¹ The attempt is not very convincing, for even the material of the explanation limits our communion with God to the effect that Christ has upon us. Ritschl, as well as Garvie, uses the words God and Christ interchangeably, and only by reason of such use are they able to maintain immediate communion of the believer with God.

We can agree that God's way of bringing us into relationship with him is through the revelation of himself given in Christ, but the revelation having thus effected its central purpose, it should bring us into fellowship with God, even as Christ had prayerful communion with him. By means of Christ's revelation we are brought to God, communion with whom is in terms of that character we have seen in Christ. Against Ritschl, Campbell maintained that Christ always stands for us, not in the place of God, but as the Redeemer in whom we ever find the meaning of God, and in whom we also find strength for faith. And further, Campbell would add, what Ritschl does not provide for, that we find in our own religious experience, in which Christ has led the way, verification of that character of God in whom we are putting our trust.

Valuable as so much in Ritschl is, there are nevertheless basal ideas which hinder the best interests of the Christian faith. Ritschl falls down when he attempts to expound that which should be most important in theology, viz. the work of

1. The Ritschlian Theology, Garvie, p.143-147.

Christ, and in particular the relation of Christ's work to mankind. Schleiermacher fell far short here, and Ritschl also has not satisfied the requirements of the Christian conscience. It is right at this centre of Christianity that Campbell was thoroughly at home, and thus gave to us a far higher and nobler conception of the atonement than came within the reach of either Schleiermacher or Ritschl.

On the matter of sin, a theory of which is a necessary presupposition of the atonement, we find that Ritschl has improved upon Schleiermacher. Ritschl criticized Schleiermacher for regarding sin as a hitherto unattained moral perfection, instead of recognizing it properly as sin. Ritschl could not regard God as incapable of apprehending our sin. He recognizes the fact of sin and guilt. He banishes original sin in order to make more real our responsibility, and also to justify our consciousness of guilt. Ritschl does not accept the old Rabbinic doctrine that all evils follow as God's retribution on our sin. He makes punishment a matter of the inner spirit through alienation from God. Then, says Ritschl, acknowledging this situation to ourselves, we are aware that certain outward evils are veritably punishments which have come upon us because of our alienation.

But, when Ritschl proceeds to the point where he introduces the idea of pardonable sin as sin of ignorance, he has weakened his whole case for the reality of the consciousness of guilt. The guilt we feel can hardly be very strong on such a basis. It may be true that in particular instances our sin has been due to ignorance, but we are nevertheless aware that

had we been walking on the high level of Christian communion where it behoved us to walk, we had not in all probability committed this particular sin. Our conscience does find us out, and refuses to let us go until we confess our guilt. Christian faith is not strengthened by introducing the weakness of ignorance. The fact is that from day to day in the Christian life, the Christian knows that all his wrong attitudes of mind are chargeable to himself and that the plea of ignorance *What question?* begs the whole question.

This view of sin has other far reaching effects tending to minimize the true value of the consciousness of guilt altogether. Ritschl holds that in our religious experience, though it seems to us that God has changed toward us because we feel how much we have changed in experiencing a new relation to God, yet there is no such change on God's part. No allowance is made for changes of any kind on God's side. They are in short expressly denied. Fixed God's purposes may be, but Ritschl does not conceive of any changes as possible within that fixed purpose. This is fatal, for it removes the possibility of Fatherly relations with God. God is thus limited to undeviating will and purpose, though it may be a loving will. Garvie has well said in this connection that Ritschl makes God a fixity without change, instead of identity in variation.¹ In contrast to Ritschl we may offer the refutation of Campbell, who thinks of divine love as unchanging in that it is love, yet must because it is love ever change in the look with which it regards us according to our changing selves.²

1. The Ritschlian Theology, Garvie, p. 309. 2. p. 145 of this thesis

There is "diversity in His dealings with individual spirits", and that is because, "a personal will and not a mere spiritual law demands our faith."¹

There is also the consideration in Ritschl's suggestion regarding our guilt that if he is correct, then experience is no aid for reality. If our religious experience of a change in God toward us is wholly illusory, what are we to make of our other experiences? If an assertion of our religious experience and conscience so general as this particular experience happens to be, does not correspond to the reality in God, we are bereft of what we might have believed to be appropriate material for theological inference.

As might be expected in the light of the preceding, there is no such attitude in God as wrath against sin. Ritschl has not penetrated the meaning of sin nor understood the order of the moral universe when he denies God's wrath against sin. Punishment for sin is a more objective fact, than that subjective experience of Ritschl which, during the feeling of guilt, causes the individual to attribute external evils to it as punishment. The external punishments operate whether the sinner acknowledges his sin or not. Our experience makes plain to us that there is punishment for sin, and we think of this as written into the very order of the universe. It is God's universe and we see no necessity for denying an attitude of wrath against sin on God's part, when manifestly He has written the fact so plainly across life and history.

1. "Thoughts on Revelation", Campbell, p.79-82.

It seems that forgiveness of sins is not so great a gift of God in Ritschl's theology as in that of Campbell. Man's capacity for moral recovery is sufficient to explain the action of God, but unless sin is as bad as Campbell shows it to be, moral recovery falls short of its full meaning. We shall observe that Ritschl's superficial view of sin prevents him from comprehending the significance of the Cross. We are in sin, and we have some responsibility for our being there, and unless we recognize with deep gravity this fact, we can never have the sense of guilt we should have. Where this sense of guilt is dulled at all, there follows a blunting of our moral responsibility all along the line. Surely if we view our own sin lightly and do not regard God as displeased with us, it is hardly likely that we will view our brother's sin with grave earnestness.

If, as Ritschl holds, there is no real hindrance of sin in the way of God's intention to establish the Kingdom of God, why speak of forgiveness at all? We recall Campbell's passionate portrayal of the Master's grief and suffering over our sin, and only so do we attain to some comprehension of how sinful sin really is. We cannot appreciate our salvation until we do see the significance of sin. Conversion cannot seem so important to us where the repulsiveness of sin is not realized.

Perhaps one important reason why the individual character of sin is lost for Ritschl, is due to the dominance of the community idea both in respect to sin and the Kingdom of God. The forgiveness and justification which comes through Christ

are granted to the Christian community as a whole, according to Ritschl, so that the individual receives such forgiveness only by virtue of membership in that community. Forgiveness of sins is accorded to the community as a community, and similarly with justification, the church and not the individual is the direct object of it.¹ We regard this manner of conceiving the community as a basic error, and by following its implications it is possible to note the ill effects on the right appreciation of the atonement.

It is Christ who leads men to God, to be sure, but Ritschl is wrong when he places the community before the individual. This of course would follow from his looking upon sin in terms of a kingdom of sin, but the same error is at work in both places. There is a kingdom of sin we must admit, a veritably real corporate wrong loaded down with social sin, but only to the extent that individuals have in the past contributed and do still contribute to its propagation by their individual sin. It is true there is a disordered relation between the individual and God, and that one of the evils of this is, that the evil spreads itself out beyond the life that is immediately responsible and effects the whole community. But the fact remains that if individuals had been right with God, the community had not sinned. Certainly we shall not remedy existing evils by converting the community en masse, but solely through transformed individuals working together. It is therefore logically incorrect to make the community

1. Justification and Reconciliation p. 543.

come first in the religious relation and make it wholly regulative.

The same fundamental error is present in the application of forgiveness to the community rather than to the individual. Religion we would maintain is essentially an individual relation between God and man, which is completed only in the complementary relation of man's love to man. The Christian in his experience with God has an individual experience, not a collective one. This effort to personalize the community is not satisfactory and does injustice to the facts of religious experience. The community is made of individuals, individual experiences, individual consciences, and the effort to make the community an entity in its relation to God is to deal with an unreality. How could it exist? We have nothing in experience or reason to warrant the assumption.

If we must think in these terms which Kitschl suggests, then the community must be the medium of the individual's relation to God. This is really an unavoidable consequence, and Kitschl's position, therefore, practically asserts this. The individual is related to the community, and the community is related to God. Of course it is always true that the individual does have a relation to the community, but we cannot set aside the fact that at any particular time the community is a community of individuals, each individual of which has its own relation to God.

Much of the error we see in Kitschl is traceable to his interpretation of the fundamental axiom that God is directed with inflexible purpose toward the establishment of the king-

dom of God founded by Christ. There is so much truth expressed in the idea that at first sight it might appear that too much stress could hardly be laid upon it. But an over-emphasis is possible and its chief danger lies in thinking of the individual too much as means to the community's end, and not enough of the individual as an end in himself. And Ritschl in doing this, lost much of the essential individual character of Christianity, both in its relation to sin and individual salvation.

When Ritschl attempts to explain the atonement, the character of the explanation is what it is just because of the errors we have considered. His inadequate interpretation of sin, and his overemphasized stress on the community as a unit, mar the significance of the life, sufferings and death of Christ. Ritschl's statement that the death of Christ is a clear illustration of his personal trust in God and of his spiritual mastery of the world is beyond praise. But when Ritschl says that Christ in coming to God on man's behalf, representing the community, freed his followers from alienation to God and made them true children of the heavenly Father, we must ask how? How does Christ create a saving faith? How is Christ in his life and sufferings related to men? Ritschl does his best to reply, but it does not come from the same depths nor carry the same spiritual force that characterizes the utterance of Campbell.

The illustration which Ritschl uses to explain Christ's relation to his people is that of the Old Testament priest, who in the sacrificial service is acting for the whole people,

bringing all into fellowship with the spirit of God. "The priest draws near to God when he brings near the gift, therefore he represents before God those in whose behalf he is acting; it is not meant that because the priest and the sacrifice come near to God, the others may remain at a distance from God."¹ But what content is there in the relation? in what way does that which Christ did effect his followers to seek a relation similar to that which Christ enjoyed with the Father? Other than this analogy from the Old Testament just now referred to, Ritschl fails to provide an answer. Ritschl's analysis of theological problems at many points is so very acute and thoroughgoing that his failure at this juncture is not less than glaring. It is hardly unfair to say that Ritschl does not know what to do with the Cross. He does make the explanation that the believer, assured of divine Grace through the general effect of Christ's life upon him, tends to associate this assurance with the supreme event in that life. But how impotent is this explanation as compared with the view which sees in Christ suffering love, suffering because of sin, a showing forth of such love that it prostrates us before God and sweeps through us with an intensity to cleanse our hearts from sin. This intensity and passion is missing from Ritschl. How could it be otherwise considering his position in reference to sin? And furthermore, Ritschl relates the work of Christ on the Cross to the community as a whole. The dominance of this notion has had a dire effect on his appreciation of Christ.

1. Justification and Reconciliation.p.474.

Ritschl did not sufficiently think of the kingdom of God as an organism made up of saved individuals, apart from which the kingdom of God has no existence. In the parable of the Prodigal Son, the father does not scan the horizon with anxious gaze in the interest of a complete family circle, however desirable that object may be. He yearns for his son. When the boy returns, what does the father say? He does not rejoice simply because every segment of the family circle is now in place. What the father does say makes plain what he was feeling all the time. "My son was dead and is alive again, he was lost and is found." To our mind, Ritschl lost the deeply personal note in Christianity; the profound sense of the individual relation to God and from which alone springs the intense motive to live in accordance with His will. It is only loyalty to God in the filial relation which alone can truly work out as loyalty to the kingdom.

Ritschl in placing the community first, jeopardized the fundamental basis of Christianity. The stress on this idea pushed the pivot of Christianity off its true centre. One extremely significant fact about Jesus and the Christianity which flows from him is the emphasis placed on the value of the individual, and the individual's relation to God as Father. Because of this, Christ could see the complete meaning of sin. Professor Stevens has a remarkable passage in which he brings out what we have in mind at this point.

"It was Jesus' sense of man's infinite worth which supplied the measure by which he estimated whatever debased and ruined man. Hence no other ever saw and portrayed the exceeding sinfulness of sin as Jesus did. His pure eye saw deep down into the inmost nature of sin as a perversion

of the moral life, a wrong choice and preference, a corruption of the will and of the affections, a threatened atrophy and loss of the soul. On the white background of his own conscious holiness, in the perfect light of the divine perfection, he saw and felt, as no other ever did, the black enormity of sin."¹

Here then is where Nitschl lost out and where Schleiermacher failed, but as we have had sufficient cause to see, this emphasis on individual worth and individual relation to God made Campbell understand sin in personal terms.

The introduction of this note of individual value into morality as a result of Christ, changed the very conception of ethics. And then this moral interest, this love for man, taken into religion as a part of religion changed religion from what it had been and made it Christian. In consequence we have received a religion which is a moral dynamic. Nitschl, however, actually separated morality from faith, and did so just because of the onesidedness of the community idea. Instead of linking faith in God with love toward men, thus providing an immediate moral action and attitude arising out of the religious relation, Nitschl separated these two and made good works follow religion only after faith had first appropriated for its own end the goal of the Kingdom which is God's end.² Christ made the relation between love to God and love to men more immediate, and in this respect Campbell followed in the footsteps of the founder of the faith.

Religion, if it is Christian, will fulfil the moral law, because love of men, whose value is now realized through a knowledge of God as Father, is included in the religious re-

1. Christian doctrine of salvation, G.B. Stevens, p.269.
2. Justification and reconciliation, p.522.

lation. This relation after all is the only adequate dynamic to make the moral law effective. "For looking at men as they are, what hope is there from the existence and fixedness of moral and spiritual laws, if there be not one who is dealing with men to bring them into conformity with these laws?" "To look up and see no rather, is to look round and see no brother."¹ However, it needs to be marked that Christianity is not the moral law; but that its spirit of love to man arising out of love to a fatherly God, does what a moral law requires, but toward which end the moral law itself offers no compelling dynamic. If religion is Christian, it will have moral force. Campbell saw this so plainly that he made it a constant feature of his teaching.

One is forced to pay tribute to Campbell's incisive analysis of the work of Christ. He was a contemporary of both Schleiermacher and Ritschl, though the period of his main contribution is directly between these two men. Schleiermacher and Ritschl were both engaged in a conscious effort to build a theological structure independent of philosophy. But it is certain that their philosophical background coloured their theological findings, and with unfortunate effect. Campbell had no such conscious aim. He did believe, however, that Christianity and philosophy were not incompatible if you could get the right view of both, but he saw no way of getting one view in which he could satisfactorily relate the two. In a letter to the Bishop of Argyll, Campbell said, "the physical, 1. thoughts on revelation, Campbell, p. 147-149.

the metaphysical, and the spiritual, are to me three regions in each of which I have some feeling of knowing where I am; while I keep, so to speak, in its centre, and when it itself bounds my horizon. But if I attempt to ascend to a point above them, from which an extended horizon will encircle them all, and from which I may see the fines which mark off each and define it, I seem not to have yet wings with which so to soar."¹ Campbell would have no quarrel with the man who sought to reach that ethereal height, but for himself he gave his attention to the interpretation of the fact of Christ. Christ and Christianity as facts needed to be understood and to this task he devoted himself. The results of that effort have been described. In comparison with Schleiermacher and Kitschl, we are required to offer our opinion that Campbell expounded Christianity better than either of these great figures, and introduced a strain of thinking superior to that at which any of the contemporary theologians had arrived.

1. Memorials vol. II, p. 176.

Chapter VIII

The Influence of Campbell.

The influence of Campbell has been like a ray of light. It has passed over many places and shined on many lives. The complete effect we shall never know. We cannot now know how numerous is that multitude illumined by his teaching, but directly and indirectly it has become a great throng. We shall presently indicate in a measure what Campbell's general influence has been, but it is necessary to observe first any connection or dependence we can between Campbell's theory of the atonement and those who have since followed.

Relation to R. C. Moberly.

In books and articles dealing with the atonement, it is customary to follow references to Campbell with a treatment of Moberly. The views are supposed to be similar and are, therefore, classified together. R. C. Moberly is understood to have followed out lines laid down by Campbell.

It is natural for writers to link these two men so long as Campbell's theory is designated as "vicarious repentance." Moberly may have been influenced in his theory of "vicarious penitence" by Campbell's book on the atonement. However, he does not acknowledge such dependence, though he does give Campbell an honoured place. But Moberly was conscious of important differences between himself and Campbell. These

differences do exist and are in fact more significant than even he realized. We are constrained to make the singular statement that to the extent to which Campbell did influence Moberly, it was, to our mind, an influence in the wrong direction.

We should prefer, for reasons of space, to avoid a discussion of Moberly's position, and simply declare the utter incompatibility of Moberly and Campbell on the atonement. But the association of these two theories has been of such long standing, that some definite consideration of Moberly seems called for in order to justify our assertion that the two views are quite out of touch.

Moberly's volume¹ is a philosophic or rather mystical disquisition on atonement and personality in terms of thorough going absolute idealism. Moberly prepares the way for the complete identity of the being of God and Jesus, and the actual literal inclusiveness of mankind in Christ by the introduction of a new treatment of the terms "penitence" and "forgiveness."

Penitence at the outset appears to be satisfactory enough when it is understood to be a real change of self and is the triumph of righteousness within. A perfect penitence would be a re-identification of the self with righteousness. Perfect penitence, however, is impossible, for sin has marred the attainment of it. Perfect penitence could come only to one absolutely sinless. But there is in Christian experience the fact of penitence. This penitence is only partial; it is

1. Atonement and Personality, R.C. Moberly.

imperfect. What is the source of the penitence we do have? It does not come from ourselves, but from Christ within, by virtue of the Spirit's presence. Moberly declares this to be, however, not another personality, but the true self being re-identified with Christ within.¹ Though Moberly says we do not cease to be ourselves as we grow in oneness of spirit with Christ, this is obviously not so, for there is a practical denial of a realistic view of the self. The realistic view of self is set aside, for on Moberly's scheme, the self is not really the self until it becomes re-identified with the Holy Spirit. Our righteousness, when we become righteous, is regarded as Christ's righteousness in a very literal sense. He is within. The human self, or what the unsophisticated usually regards as self, must be conceived of as a negative self. There is no room for particular selves when the Absolute God or Christ or Holy Spirit has conquered the negation of our present sinful incomplete existences. This may seem to be an extreme characterization, but the justice of it will appear as we proceed.

The doctrine of forgiveness logically follows penitence and similarly is never complete. Moberly is of the opinion that a perfect forgiveness toward a person anything short of his being actually perfect, is a treating "as if" he were righteous, which he is not.² Only to the degree that a man is forgiveable is he forgiven, but Moberly thinks that complete forgiveableness implies human perfection before forgiveness

can be fully realized. So therefore, "As there is upon earth no consummated penitence, so neither is there any forgiveness consummated."¹

Moberly wants it to be understood that forgiveness can be forfeited and he is interested to safeguard this idea. A person completely forgiven would have attained perfection, and in perfection there is no forfeiture of forgiveness. In this life then, we do not attain complete forgiveness and we may forfeit that amount which we have received. To this end the servant parable is quoted. But this parable while sustaining the idea of forfeiture, a necessary idea, does nevertheless refute the notion of incomplete forgiveness. The lord of the servant said, "thou wicked servant, I forgave thee." The lord forgave the servant, not in part; he forgave all.

Moberly would have us think that love does not completely embrace the sinner in his sin, nor even he who is just starting on a Christian career, because at such time there is not yet a perfect penitence. Love embraces only him in whom forgiveness is consummated in perfection. Forgiveness here is only "a beginning, whose entire consummation, should it ever be consummated, would mean in a perfect penitent, nothing less than a real and living righteousness." "And forgiveness when it reaches its consummation, is love's embrace of such penitence as this."²

Is this really Christian? We think Moberly has distorted the meaning of penitence and forgiveness. This will be

especially evident when we apply it to Christ. Moberly makes penitence and forgiveness as always in process of becoming. These terms are made to coincide with sanctification; the growth of the disciple in the Christian life. It may be true that penitence and forgiveness are always elements in Christian experience, but Christian growth should not be described in these terms. These words have already acquired a recognized meaning in theological literature.

But further, it is not, as Moberly thinks, psychologically impossible for God to forgive the sinner and to accept him as righteous. It is possible for the sinner to be made righteous here and now though still liable to fall. Is there no such reality as righteous will and purpose in man? Mistakes he makes and will continue to make, but if he is Christian he is struggling against these downward tendencies, and he is so struggling just because he is already a new creature in Christ, and because there is already present in him righteous will and purpose and intention. The Christian's real aspiration and intention are directed to do the will of God; for this he prays and strives. And as Campbell made plain, it is this new will in man born of faith, which justifies man before God. It is not a case of treating a man as if he were what he is not, but God has forgiven him absolutely because he is now righteous, righteous in will, though even yet he sometimes stumbles and may possibly fall. Even the neophyte in the faith may not appreciate in all its fullness, the far flung meaning and effect of his sin, but if all the will and mind he does have is turned in sincere and unreserved penitence to God; could

anything more than this satisfy God; does there need to be anything more than this before the finger of God will write peace, perfect peace in the heart of that man?

Our criticism is assuming of course that there are particular selves which can have individual relations with God, but Moberly has been paving the way for his view that humanity is all of one piece. In this way he is enabled literally to identify us with Christ; we are included in Him, for He is also identically God. Jesus is God and the Father is God, "singularis unicus et totus Deus". We are not to say that the Son is like the Father; "What the Father is, that is the Son, not similarly but identically."¹ Jesus is also inclusively man. "His relation to the human race is not that He was another specimen, differing by being another, from everyone except Himself. His relation to the race was not a differentiating, but a consummating relation. He was not generically, but inclusively man."¹

It is indeed difficult to convince oneself that there is very much real meaning here. But it is argued by way of elucidation that we are all more closely united than we suppose. Our distinctness from one another is perhaps not so ultimate as we are inclined to think - "nay, even unity of all men into one." "Is it not true that we have in many ways overdone our lesson, and exaggerated in common thought and theory, the mutual exclusiveness of human personality?" "Are we not all, after all, more of one piece than we are willing to recognize?"²

The illustration¹ of the mother and daughter is to the point here. A daughter has sinned, and of course the mother suffers; the finer she is in character the more she suffers, but Moberly does not stop there. Very literally he declares, "In her child's fall, she fell." The illustration is intended to help us in seeing the fundamental unity of all humanity.

"It is precisely here that the relation of Jesus Christ to humanity is unique." "He alone was not generically but inclusively man."² An illustration offered is our relation to Adam, but we are not less inclusively in Christ. This is not a metaphor, but stands for a spiritual merger. If I grow at least towards unity of spirit with my friend, it is not really that I am in him or he in me, but in the case of Christ there is a realistic indwelling.³ Humankind is summed up anew and included in Christ."⁴ Humanity is in Christ, and it is to be recalled that Christ is God.

If Jesus is God identically in being, it is not easy to conceive how Christ can offer penitence to God for the atonement of human sin, but so it is. If we ask how God can render penitence for human sin, we are given a definition of penitence which makes penitence much wider than its accepted meaning. "Is reality of penitence for personal sin really possible in what is not the self-identical personality that sinned?"⁵ Moberly answers in the affirmative and adds, it is an every day occurrence. Penitence can be done for us in another. However, he interprets the vicarious suffering we do for others as penitence.

1.p.124. 2.p.88, Atonement and Personality. 3.Ibid. p.89.
4.Ibid. p.90. 5.Ibid. p.118.

Sympathetic suffering and penitence are the same thing. The fact is, therefore, that what Moberly illustrates as penitence is not penitence at all from one point of view. He has simply equated suffering sympathy with penitence. And now, bearing in mind the mother and daughter illustration, we are given to understand that Christ having humanity in himself, is identified with our sin, at least to the extent of our consciousness of sin. Christ will have "a real personal self-identity with the consciousness of sin, as well as self-identity with absolute righteousness."¹ Thus he will have perfect penitential holiness. But as we notice in the following quotation, there is more than penitence in what Christ does; there is also penal infliction.

"He then on the Cross, offered, as man to God, not only the sacrifice of utter obedience, under conditions (themselves the consequence of human transgression) which made the effort of such perfect will-obedience more tremendous than we can conceive; but also the sacrifice of supreme penitence, that is, of perfect will identity with God in condemnation of sin, himself being so self-identified with sinners, that this could take the form of the offering of himself for sin. He voluntarily stood in the place of the utterly contrite - accepting insult, shame, anguish, death - death possible only by his own assent, yet outwardly inflicted as penal; nay more in his own inner consciousness, accepting the ideal consciousness of the contrite - which is the one form of the penitent's righteousness: desolate, yet still, in whatever he was, voluntary; and in that very voluntariness of desolation, sovereign. He did in fact and in full, that which would in the sinner constitute perfect atonement, but which has forever become impossible to the sinner, just in proportion as it is true that he has sinned."²

All of this is not clear, but there is sufficient evidence to show the penal and substitutionary character of the

1. p.129.

2. p.129-130

language, though of course the theory of all humanity as one in Christ would be offered against the use of the word substitution. But in so far as this literal union is advanced, the theory is not at all conceivable to reason or reasonable to faith. The abstract speculation which is here observable seems far removed from the realm of religious experience. It is an instance of what can happen when Christ is removed from real life, and forced into a provided place in some system. All kinds of unsatisfying explanations must be brought forward to meet the facts of reality. For example, the declaration of absolute identity between God and Christ cannot be maintained so soon as we deal with the historic Jesus. We find ourselves using language which contravenes that identity. Moberly speaks of Christ's "relation of absolute dependence upon Another - the rather that is God..."¹ Christ has an "unreserved union of dependence upon his God." Thus the very facts of Christ's life force Moberly to make verbal distinctions which are of course inconsistent with the thorough application of the identity theorem. Realistic identity brings up the very problems which have always caused difficulty in this field.

Furthermore, the facts of Christ's life present us with his temptations, the genuineness of which, as well as the reality of their defeat, we do not doubt. By recognizing their genuineness we find a help to ourselves that Christ did not succumb to sin. We refuse to accept dual personality, yet we believe we see in him human consciousness that is God-like

1. p.100.

Is this unitarian?

and therefore divine. Moberly also denies dual personality, but his explanation of Christ's consciousness causes him great difficulty. So much is this the case that the possibility in Christ of sinning, is not real but hypothetical. The manner of expounding this assertion is in violent contrast to Campbell's naturalness.

Though Moberly refers to the hypothetical capacity for sin, he nevertheless is very desirous of guarding the human side of Christ to bring him within our range, so he says we must think of Christ as somewhat dependent on himself.

"To be clothed with human flesh, and to be accessible to human emotions, though it does not mean the actual setting up of a human self in antithesis to his divine self; does at least mean a providing with the natural capacities for separation and rebellion; it does mean that the presence of rebellion could be felt, and that there could be stern repression and effort in obedience..." However, Moberly goes on to say, "if there was not an actualized, there was (so to speak) an imaginary and hypothetical possibility of a distinct self, willing otherwise than in accordance with God's will; a possibility which is not really possible, for it would have meant literally chaos, the very self-contradiction of the Being of God; but which nevertheless, dimly images itself at some supreme moments to the imagination, and gives at least some meaning to the refusal of separateness." "And it is this strange, dim, vision or idea of a possibility which nevertheless is not possible, which gives their deepest dread and mystery to some of the most mysterious - and most appalling - moments of all: such as, 'Now is my soul troubled, and what shall I say? Father save me from this hour.'¹ "And the prayer, 'not as I will but as Thou wilt'..."

These explanations certainly do not explain. we cannot say of this as we said of Campbell, that it has a divine naturalness. In Moberly's book we seem to be constantly dealing with mystical and mysterious modes of thought far removed

1. p.105-106.

from the world where there are hungry hearts and where men work and play and love and sorrow. It does not create the atmosphere in which the Master laboured when to penitent men and women he could say, "Thy sins be forgiven thee", and they were made whole.

We are not surprised, therefore, at the three specific criticisms which Moberly directs at Campbell. He questions Campbell's wisdom in dropping punishment as applied to Christ's death. For our part, we regard Campbell's own exposure of the penal theory as unanswerable.

Another criticism is aimed at the absence of a doctrine of the Holy Spirit. We have already made a passing reference to it, but there is the further consideration that Moberly has a special interest behind his stricture on Campbell at this point. Moberly would make the Holy Spirit operative in the Eucharist. He thinks Campbell's position is weak for not linking together the atonement and the Eucharist by means of effective divine agency in that sacrament.¹ But many years before, Campbell published a book, "Christ the Bread of Life,"² which was designed to defeat just this tendency toward sacramentalism. This book appeared at the time when public attention was drawn to discussions regarding the Mass. Campbell in his original way lifted the whole question to a level on which the issues involved could be seen, and gave food for thought to both

1. Atonement and Personality, R.C. Moberly, p. 410.

2. This book had a great influence on the Bishop of Argyll, who accepted its interpretation as his own. The Memoir of the Bishop indicates the great use made of these ideas on the Eucharist. They are traceable in several of his addresses to the ministry.

Catholics and Protestants. Brief references only can be made to this interesting volume, but we shall indicate sufficiently the line of argument which will suffice to refute Moberly's sacramentarian position.

The Lord's Supper is not intended to be mysterious at all, but it requires a "living conformity with the meaning of the symbolical act in which at His command we have engaged."¹ But instead of this, "An ordinance which bore witness to the life of faith has become a mystery embodying spiritual life in material elements."² This would be the receiving of spiritual power in the dark, for we could not understand or apprehend, nor ever expect to understand or apprehend it. Such a faith "is not a faith in spiritual truth spiritually discerned, but faith in a physical mystery not discerned but assumed on authority."

We have called attention to Moberly's seeming satisfaction with mystery, and Campbell has shown in his discriminating way the connection between undue sacramental emphasis and intellectual refuge in mystery. "In proportion as the food of life is believed to be received in the bread and the wine, it is less and less sought through belief of the truth. Nay, in proportion as that is conceived of as the highest act of religion, and the act in which there is assumed to be most absolute participation of Christ which is most entirely away from the region of consciousness and of spiritual discernment, that region loses its interest and men withdraw from it."³ Of such an anti-intellectual view, Campbell said, "I cannot so cheat myself."

1. Christ the Bread of Life, Campbell, p.19. 2. ibid. p.22.

3. Christ the Bread of Life, p.43.

"When partaking of the Lord's Supper, I by my bodily senses take cognizance of the bread and wine, and know what they are as I consciously partake of them; while in my spiritual nature I deal with the spiritual realities which they symbolize..."¹ Both the physical and spiritual aspect are "experienced realities" in neither is there any mystery." Anything different from this requires us to find a new conception of what the eternal life is that we receive in Christ.

These references serve as Campbell's reply to Moberly's sacramental interests. And there is much more of value in Campbell's book on the Eucharist; many rich gems of thought which exerted an influence upon thinking minds. It was not popular, however, not because it was not clear, but because it was not good propaganda material against Catholics. Protestants themselves were called to examine whether, as they approached the Lord's Table, they were regarding it as something to lean upon rather than as a communing hour in which the spirit found fresh inspiration. So that in presenting a forcible exposure of the spiritual inadequacies of the Roman Mass, Campbell also called to mind the shortcomings of Protestantism. This was not in the interests of volume of sales, but even so, a second edition was called for, indicating thinking minds were being reached by its thoughtful originality.

Moberly's third complaint against Campbell is to the effect that Campbell did not sufficiently unite Christ to the believer. We have, in a preceding chapter, dealt with Campbell's refusal to so identify Christ and the believer as to make no in-

1. Ibid. p.30.

telligible distinction between them, and this we maintain is one of the great things in the exposition. Campbell has feared to speculate about spiritual relations, the nature of which is not at all apparent to reason or to religious experience. He saw that the gospel of Christ must be presented to human minds and that they were responsible for accepting or rejecting it. But he does not, like Moberly, sink all human selves in the One Humanity. To do so is to make human life unreal and complicate its problems into hopeless confusion. It seems to us that Moberly has done just this. The strange tangle of philosophy and religion does not square with religious demands nor experience.

It seems to us that Moberly's background of philosophy does not call for an atonement. If human personality is all in one piece, and our independent selves are not real after all, but all are in Christ, then if we develop our thought consistently, what place is there for atonement? What meaning can atonement have, for if Jesus is identically God, how could he render penal satisfaction? It is cause for wonder that on the premises laid down, Moberly should include the penal element in Christ's suffering. In short, the theory is extremely inconsistent and leaves a host of insistent questions entirely to one side.¹

We are of the opinion that Moberly in his animadversions on Campbell, has passed judgment on his own theory. It is apparent that had it not been for the somewhat opaque character of Campbell's language in his sixth chapter, there never could have been the association that has classified Campbell's and Moberly's theories together.

1. In referring to Moberly, Stevens has said, "I find it impossible to extract from the volume as a whole any self-consistent general view of our subject. p. 216, Christian Doctrine of Salvation."

Vicarious Penitence in W. H. Moberly.

W. H. Moberly on the other hand, has advanced a view on the atonement which is in many ways superior to the theory of his father. He gives a greater place to the facts of Christian experience, and presents a more consistent view.¹ But we still object to the same use of vicarious penitence for a process which is not really penitence. It is recognized that the suffering which another does on our account, i.e., truly vicarious sympathy, has a purifying effect upon ourselves. This is the heart of the matter, and is essentially the same principle which Campbell uses in the development of the negative aspect of atonement, e.g., that the revelation that God grieves over our sins is the stimulus which prostrates us in deep contrition before the Father. But we cannot understand why Mr. Moberly insists on calling this penitence.

Penitence, repentance and contrition are terms applied to the attitude of personal repentant sorrow for one's own sins, and one's own act of turning to God. It means change of heart, change of purpose, change of direction. It is a psychological situation which can occur only in the guilty individual. If we could, so to speak, take a cross section of a father's mind whose son is in deep sin, and compare it with the mind of that son when he becomes penitent, would we have the same psychological phenomenon? Could we simply transfer these states of mind from one to the other and still be as we were? In describing the son's mind we would use the word penitence, but Moberly also

1 - "The Atonement" in Foundations 1912.

wants us to use penitence to describe the mind of the father who feels deep anguish for his son's sins. Obviously there must be some difference in the two cases. However much a loving parent may sympathetically suffer for a child's sins, he could not feel in mind as the repentant child himself feels. So that in applying the word penitence to Christ, we should be obliged to think of him as contrite and penitent, turning from sin with a consciousness of guilt, for consciousness of guilt is implied in penitence.

Campbell expressly eliminated on Christ's part any personal consciousness of guilt in his view of the sympathetic sufferings, and if we would remove the element of personal guilt or personal consciousness of guilt, we have an attitude of mind, which, whatever else it is, is not penitence.

Relation to Other Theories of Atonement.

Haering of Tübingen is often referred to as having in his early works, a theory similar to that of Campbell's so-called "vicarious repentance." It is supposedly a theory in which Christ is regarded as supplementing by repentance, the incomplete repentance of sinners. Ritschl has pointed out that Haering's view does not imply repentance on the part of Christ.¹ And more recently, Professor H. R. Mackintosh has said, "Haering is quite clear that to speak of Christ's repentance is to use

1 - Justification and Reconciliation, Ritschl p. 553. Here Ritschl refers to Haering's, "Ueber das Bleibende im Glauben an Christus" 1880.

words wrongly."¹ But it is agreed that Christ did a work having some kind of supplementary value which filled man's imperfect penitence.. However, in his recent large work,² Haering has adopted a view which makes the action of Christ's work upon us, the same in nature as that which Campbell is here represented as teaching.

Repentance he declares, is the crucial matter which concerns us. Our sense of guilt is our punishment which can only be wiped away by our repentance, and this we are enabled to do because of Christ. "His recognition of the inviolable will of God, in sorrowing sympathy with us who are guilty, by means of which He awakens repentance on our part, is real homage of the most truly personal kind rendered to God."³ And through this penitence which is now awakened in us, we have fulfilled the necessary requirement for pardon and oneness with God. Christ's suffering has an immediate relation or effect upon us, and for that reason is valuable in the sight of God. In other words, it is valuable in God's sight because of what that sympathy and suffering accomplish in us. "Accordingly we have not by a judgment of God a transference to us of a performance of His, as that of another person; but we have a recognition of what Christ effects in us...."⁴

1 - Some Aspects of Christian Belief, H.R.Mackintosh, p.88 referring to Haering's "Zur Versöhnungslehre" 1893.

2 - The Christian Faith - A system of Dogmatics, 2 vols. 1912.

3 - The Christian Faith, Haering, vol. II, p. 647.

4 - The Christian Faith, Haering, vol. II, p. 653.

Haering worked out to this position over a long period of years, and it is quite plainly in harmony with Campbell's main emphasis, though much of the detail is very different. Haering, however, so far as we have any knowledge, knew nothing of Campbell's work. The names are frequently linked together, but to the extent that in the past they have been so connected, it has been due to a misapprehension of the work of these men, both of whose systems were classified by the formula, "vicarious repentance."

Campbell's doctrine of the atonement, though not specifically adopted by other men, especially in Campbell's form of it, influenced the thoughts of many on the subject. There can be no doubt that Professor Robert Mackintosh is under debt to the inspiration of Campbell. He would no doubt be happy to assent to this, for his tribute to Campbell is a glowing one. When the constructive outline of Dr. Mackintosh's recent book¹ is compared with the prominent features of the present exposition of Campbell, the influence is unmistakeable. Similarly the closing sections of Principal Caird's Gifford Lectures, bear silent testimony to the friendship and influence of Campbell.

Many theological students and ministers in England and Scotland were in contact with the volume on the atonement. Principal Tulloch in his classes, devoted time to the exposition of the book and commended it to the students with generous praise.² The eldest son of Dr. Campbell was a minister in the

¹ - Historic Theories of the Atonement, Robert Mackintosh.

² - Memorials vol. I, p. 294.

Church of England, and in one of his letters to his father, writes of the frequency with which men in the Church were testifying to the value of the work on the atonement.

Influence of Campbell through "Thoughts on Revelation."

There is another direction in which Campbell exerted a significant influence. Great excitement was raised by "Essays and Reviews"¹ which represented an outbreak of liberalism in the interest of a greater freedom in the use of the historical criticism, and toward a wider application of scientific method in theology. And just prior to the appearance of "Essays and Reviews", Mansel's Bampton Lectures had been given. The controversy which grew out of Mansel's Lectures and "Essays and Reviews" had raised, in some quarters, bitter animosity, while in many minds it aroused a grave and anxious concern. In this last group belonged Campbell, who feared that the separation into camps simply submerged the real problem, and caused liberals to proceed toward unwarranted lengths, while conservatives rested more completely in external authority. Urgent entreaty on the part of friends finally induced Campbell to offer a contribution to the discussions, and in 1862 appeared his, "Thoughts on Revelation."

In this volume the attempt was made to cling still to the notion that the manner of inspiration imparted to the sacred writers was different from the divine inspiration which at the present time exerts its influence upon the spirits of men. Of course, such a position we regard as altogether untenable, and

¹ - Essays and Reviews appeared 1860.

it is not on account of this feature that we commend the book. Campbell does not use his peculiar idea of Biblical inspiration to support an infallible Scripture, which one would naturally expect to be the reason for holding it. Quite the contrary, he makes a plea against using the Bible as an external authority and proceeds to appeal for tolerance toward scientific research, and then rests the question of authority in the enlightened conscience.

The "Thoughts on Revelation" has, it seems to us, its chief value, not in its view of the Bible, but in its recognition of the obligation upon the individual conscience to respond to the

men tread."1 Experience is a form of knowledge and is part of the material of the enlightened conscience. Faith becomes verified in experience, and this makes for the development of conscience. In a letter which is apropos here, it is remarked, "I am speaking just now of that internal evidence which arises out of and which grows with religious experience, and is over and above that internal evidence which, before experience, is an element of faith."2

In revelation God is seeking to commune with us by means of the world about us and in our intimate religious experience. God works through us as it were, but it does not appear that Campbell regards this inspiration of the divine as a philosophic alter-Ego. The communion we have with God is the communion of a Father with independent personal existences. The charm of philosophic unity never deflected Campbell from the realistic demands of the religious consciousness. We are encompassed by Divine Mind which is ever trying to break through to our conscious selves, but these selves have an independence of their own.

We can know God declares Campbell. He is manifested in the external world, in the characters of other lives and in personal communion. If we cannot have such knowledge, we cannot have religion. We must trust our religious experience which is human experience at its best. Campbell asks, "How did the prodigal son know that it was his father?" He trusted the evidence which confronted him. Are we to accept the guidance of sense experie-

1 - Thoughts on Revelation p. 62-65.

2 - Memorials vol. II, p. 134.

ence and deny validity to our spiritual experience? Can we in all good reason set aside the essential claims of an experience fraught with such real values and profound satisfactions?

Campbell criticized Mansel for the obvious agnosticism of the Hampton Lectures. In his letters as well as in *Thoughts on Revelation*, he deals with the subject of God's knowableness.

"Paul at Athens found an altar with this inscription: 'To the Unknown God', and took advantage of it as some preparation for receiving his teaching, because he could say, 'Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you.' But an altar 'to the unknowable God', what preparation for hearing his message would Paul have found in that?"¹ Campbell is quite able to say, however, that if the position of Mansel is intellectually required of us, there being no worthy alternative, then no consequences which that involves "would justify us in shutting our eyes to them". But he thinks reason and faith and religious experience may be trusted.

It may well be said that this is an answer of faith, but by what philosophical justification would Campbell uphold this view? There can be no doubt that Campbell was an idealist in recognizing spiritual forces as the ultimate explanation of the universe, but he was realist enough to test the speculations of idealism by reference, not only to reason, but to experience. He never got too far off the ground, which is an indication that his early readings in Scottish "common sense" philosophy were not entirely forgotten. "Mansel deals with difficulties which are entirely

1 - Memorials vol. II, p. 317 letter to Mr. Macmillan.

products of metaphysical thought, and have no existence to the common sense and common feeling of mankind." "Still, if these difficulties are the product of a true metaphysic, and therefore real difficulties, they are not to be ignored."¹

In the letter from which the above quotation is taken, Campbell records the belief "that there is a fallacy in the metaphysical analysis of thought" made by Mr. Mansel, "and this I would not be ashamed to hold even had I no theory of the assumed fallacy to justify me." But Campbell had thought out an alternative to a purely regulative theory of knowledge. "What did suggest itself as such a theory, I afterwards found adopted in nearly the form it had taken in my own mind..." This refers to an article in the National Review², a few excerpts from which are rather important in showing the substance of the argument in which Campbell found an echo of his own thoughts. It will be noticed by the reader that the author of the article follows along Kant's idealistic line, rather than the sceptical line of the Dialectic in the Critique of Pure Reason. It was along the sceptical line that first Sir William Hamilton and then Mansel proceeded. The National Review article, however, does not at all follow out this idealism to the extremities of Hegel's Absolute.

The writer of the article believes there is some legitimate passage from psychology to ontology. "To put the matter into the shortest formula, let us say we admit the relative character of

1 - Memorials vol. I, p. 314.

2 - National Review, January 1859 (unsigned).

human thought as a psychological fact; we deny it as an ontological disqualification." All acts of the mind are discriminative. In discriminating between objects the mind distinguishes between subject and object, and "as directed upon this and not on that, cuts out a definite from an indefinite." "Is this relativity an incompetency or a qualification for thinking? a cognitive limitation or a cognitive power?" "That we cannot think except by differencing means only that we cannot know where there is nothing to be known...." "If intelligence consists in distinguishing, how can distinguishing be an incompetency to understand?" "But it will be said this relative character of knowledge at all events limits you to the finite, and precludes access to God as Infinite. On the contrary we submit that relative apprehension is always and necessarily of two terms together: if of sound, then also of silence;.... if of succession then also of duration; if of the finite then also of the infinite."

"It is the primary error of Spinoza, of Schelling, of Hegel, of all monistic speculative systems, that they set up in isolated supremacy one of two inseparable data of thought, and then endeavour to educe the other out of it; and Dr. Mansel falls, we think into the same snare. He strains after an Infinite that shall exclude the finite; an Absolute that shall emerge from all Relation; a Causality that shall be pure from all conditions; If Theism were staked on his finding such things, his despair of it would be natural enough. For these conceptions which he denies to be on speaking terms, are in each case Siamese twins, between which any affectation of estrangement cannot fail to be highly inconvenient. They come into existence before our thought together, and have their meaning only in pairs; one of the two giving us the constant and ontological ground, the other the phenomenal manifestation. The attempt to think away the finite from the presence of the infinite, or vice versa, must inevitably fail; and of the two schemes to which the attempt gives rise, viz. that which says, 'entities only can be known', and that which says, 'phenomena only can be known', both are to be unhesitatingly rejected. Two other possibilities remain, viz. the Idealism which, treating all 'relation' as a subjective economy of ours, pronounces that we know neither; and the Realism which, taking relations in the mind as exponents of relations out, decides that we know both. It is on this last alone that in our view a sound philosophy can take its stand.".....

"We confess a total insensibility to most of the alarming perplexities which our author (Mansel) endeavours to fix on the idea of the Infinite. They all arise out of the spurious Spinozistic demand that this Idea shall be kept out of relation to anything, and the false assumption that, unless this is done, the Idea is sacrificed....."

"When we ask whether, in creating the world God increased

the quantity of being, and are reminded that if He did, infinitude received addition, and if He did not, the finite world is nothing at all, the consequences do not in either case distress us.... An infinitude that supplies its own completion was potentially without defect; and the world that manifests an infinitude other than its own, atones for its non-entity. As well might you ask whether the sun's first appearance added anything to the extension of the universe, because if it did, it was not infinite before; if it did not, it could have no size."

"In forgetfulness of this principle our author pronounces the coexistence of Divine attributes inconceivable without contradiction because involving a plurality of infinitudes side by side. If the attributes were not each sui generis and if they wanted room, the remark would be true."

This quotation gives some representation of the philosophical background of Campbell's thoughts on revelation. His understanding of revelation, furthermore, was far removed from Mansel's appeal to revelation which after all is entirely inconsistent with the Hampton Lectures. As Campbell stated, Mansel precluded all appeal to revelation by cutting away every possibility of any revelation of God whatsoever. The purpose, however, of Campbell's volume was to address faith and reason without calling in technical philosophic considerations. There can be no doubt that Campbell understood philosophic problems. Norman Macleod tells us of his subtle mind which could wander far into the realms of speculative thought, but that nevertheless his profound depth of spirit balanced his intellect, and enabled him to possess child-like faith and reverence.

As has been intimated, the problems arising out of the "Essays and Reviews" and the lectures of Mansel, were not to be solved by clamping down free inquiry. No mere appeal to authority was of any valuable consequence. Campbell was very emphatic in this regard. He reproved those who, adhering tenaciously to the older view of the Scripture, would not allow the light of

the Spirit to guide others.¹ Traditional faith could not be allowed to block the path of truth. A real faith will not attempt "to bring another to see eye to eye by dint of argument or collating of texts..." This makes for controversy but not for fellowship with God in the spirit of love.

Campbell believed in the unfettered mind sincerely seeking for truth and he offered this as the only solution against dogmatism and doubt. In a finely put sentence he summarized his whole attitude: "But the tenderness, the patience and that absence of self-righteous congratulation which mark the true scholar in the school of truth, who is patiently digging for wisdom as for hidden treasure, are as much a contrast to the pride of doubt as they are to the pride of dogmatism; and it is certain that as blind credence is sometimes held a merit, so may doubt also."²

This is the spirit which permeates Thoughts on Revelation as well as the letters during this important period of widening knowledge in historical criticism and science. By plainly indicating that the character of vital faith is not dependent upon historical criticism, and need not stand in abeyance until critical problems are solved, Campbell did a noteworthy and laudable service. His appeal to conscience, and his reassertion of faith and religious experience as having something to say on their own account, is an indication of clear sightedness in a day when the issues were very much confused in both religious and academic

1 - Thoughts on Revelation pp. 113-125.

2 - Memorials vol. II, p. 163.

circles.¹ The spirit of youth with its genius for exploration had not died in this seer, who at this period had nearly filled man's allotted span of years.

Testimony to Campbell's Theological Significance.

Generous testimony regarding the important contribution made by Campbell on theological thought has been rendered. Pfeleiderer's comment has been referred to in the Introduction. Principal Tulloch in his St. Giles Lectures, speaks of Campbell's work as a "treasure to the Christian church in all time to come."² Of the Nature of the Atonement he said, it is "a truly noble monument of spiritual genius." "No modern theological work upon the whole had made a more remarkable impression upon many thoughtful minds." The Spectator in a long article said, "Dr. McLeod Campbell is, as we believe, about the most completely and profoundly Protestant of our living theologians."³ And Dr. Leckie in the Expositor has no hesitation in saying that Campbell "has indeed furnished the spritual and intellectual capital on the interest of which several theologians have supported themselves and their reputation..."⁴

Comments of this character are in strange contrast to some of the criticisms which have been dealt with. While there were some who did not appreciate Campbell, there were very many more who felt that the theory of the atonement and the work on revelation

1 - A testimony to this effect will be found in "Principal Shairp and His Friends", p. 207.

2 - Movements of Religious Thought, Principal John Tulloch, p. 156.

3 - Spectator April 30, 1868.

4 - Expositor May 1923. Dr. Leckie considers Fergus Ferguson as having received stimulus from Campbell, Fergus Ferguson His Theology and Heresy Trial, Dr. Leckie, p. 154 ff.

had met very urgent religious needs. He provided satisfaction regarding a host of problems which pressed heavily upon a large group of thinking men, and opened up to them the world of thought in which he himself dwelt - a region, in Bishop Ewing's delightful phrase - "whose sun is as the light of seven days."

Acknowledgment of Influence by Prominent Followers.

Campbell also exerted a very strong influence on a small group of men, who were in real measure his disciples - Norman Macleod, Bishop Ewing, Principal Shairp and Canon Vaughan. These men were themselves leaders of men, holding positions of distinction and influence.¹

Very little introduction to these men is required. The first named, Norman Macleod has a reputation of the very first rank. The Church's regard for him is evidenced by his having been Moderator of the Church of Scotland. And yet this man so influential and talented, has done his best to lay that glory at the feet of Campbell, his cousin. The biographer of Norman Macleod writes, "Campbell had a greater influence on Norman's views than any other theologian living or dead, and was revered by him as being the most heavenly minded man he ever knew."² But if we turn to Norman Macleod's own words, it is doubtful if it is possible to find another man of such eminence, expressing so

1 - We are not at present dealing with those intimate friends, Erskine, Maurice and A.J.Scott of whom Norman Macleod said, when he met them altogether at Dr. Campbell's house - "Such men of culture and such an atmosphere of lofty thought and deep devotion I cannot hope again to meet together on this side the grave." It is our intention to deal with these men in a proposed biographical section.

2 - Memoir of Norman Macleod by his brother, Donald Macleod, p 182

decidedly his complete devotion, and dependence upon his teacher. In his Journal he refers to the "best man I have ever known on earth or can know - my own John Campbell.....I left thee today in thy grave, and the world can never more be the same to me..... I loved him and adored him this side of idolatry! He was my St. Paul." And in his article in the magazine of which he was editor, Norman Macleod wrote: "Since the earliest days of my childhood I remember him; and since I grew to manhood I have known him, loved him, trusted him and learned from him as from no other." "Dr. Campbell was the best man without exception I have ever known. His character was the most perfect embodiment I have ever seen of the character of Jesus."¹

Such words of unrestrained feeling are not the effusive eulogy of a rustic unfamiliar with the concourse of cultured minds. Norman Macleod was a chaplain to Queen Victoria; in his generation the most distinguished figure in the Church of Scotland a man who had won fame and who enjoyed the esteem of his countrymen. And into this man's mind and character, Campbell had sown fragments of truth, which Macleod scattered like seed in unnumbered open minds.

Bishop Ewing, Bishop of Argyll and the Isles, was a prominent leader in the English Church. We have referred to his admiration of the volume on the Lord's Supper, but his dependence on

¹ - Volume for 1872, p. 353 Good Words (Advocates' Library). This magazine provided Norman Macleod with a very wide field for his ideas, and thus Campbell had great indirect influence. Of this periodical, the Contemporary Review said, it is "excellent and widely circulated.."

Campbell was not limited to this alone. In a letter to Mrs. Campbell he says, "No one owed more to his theology than I did, though many have turned it to better account. His works and those of my first teacher Mr. Erskine, form a double star, which has lightened an otherwise dark and dreary night."¹ Bishop Ewing moved in select circles of English thought. He was close to a number of influential churchmen, and was the valued friend of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Campbell's influence on Principal Shairp began during the latter's Oxford days. The channel of Principal Shairp's respect for Campbell came from the little known volume, "Fragments of Exposition".²

"I well remember," writes Principal Shairp to Rev. Donald Campbell, "about the years 1845 and 1846 at Oxford, after having heard and read a good many of Mr. Newman's sermons, and being much impressed by them, turning to this small book of your father's discourses. Though they came from a different quarter of the doctrinal heavens, and had no magic in their language as Newman's have, yet they seemed full of spirituality and that perhaps more simple and direct. They seemed equally removed from the old orthodoxy of Scotland, and from the spiritual teaching of the best Oxford men, confined as that was within a sacerdotal fence."³

From these Oxford days until Dr. Campbell passed away in 1872, Principal Shairp looked upon the writer, who became his inspiring friend, as the teacher from whom he drew in abundance. Erskine shares the honours with Campbell here, as in the case of others, but Campbell would be happy to share any

- 1 - Memoir of Alexander Ewing, Bishop of Argyll and the Isles, p. 568.
- 2 - This book is now called "Fragments of Truth", see bibliography.
- 3 - Memorials vol. II, p. 338.

good thing with Erskine. These two, so little indebted to each other regarding the truths they independently arrived at, were yet inseparable in their friendship. But it would not be far wrong to think of Campbell as the greater mind of the two, and Principal Shairp shared this feeling.

Principal Shairp was always ready to acknowledge his indebtedness to Campbell. When his book, "Lectures on Culture and Religion" was published, he sent a copy to his friend with a letter, of which the following words of encomium are but a few: "There is no one to whom the book is more due than yourself, for the suggestions I have derived from your works. I tried to acknowledge them in the book but sometimes it comes over me that I ought to have acknowledged my obligations to you more fully still....."¹

Canon D. J. Vaughan of the English Church is still another leader who became acquainted with Campbell through his writings, and then sought to know the author personally. Here again the influence was of such a character that Canon Vaughan dedicated a book to his esteemed teacher. Canon Vaughan gives an excellent description of his friend's wide intellectual grasp and spiritual simplicity; his ability to sympathize with the problems of the younger men; his open-mindedness to light from whatever quarter it might come; and his faculty for grasping the ~~ess~~entials in all perplexing questions. Intermingled with these fine qualities was a

1 - Principal Shairp and His Friends, Wm. Knight, p. 304.

winning frankness and understanding in which others' confidence and trust were readily reposed.

Canon Vaughan has stated in one of his letters that "many clergymen of the Church of England will be forever grateful to Campbell for what they learned from him." In his article in the Contemporary Review, Canon Vaughan deals with 19th Century "Scottish Influence Upon English Thought". While deserved praise is given to Erskine and others, Campbell is given the foremost place. Even though Erskine's influence found particular expression in Maurice, who in turn stimulated Robertson of Brighton and Charles Kingsley, Campbell is conceded to be the leading Scotch theologian of the 19th Century. In his tribute, Canon Vaughan says of English thought what may be said of Scottish thought as well - "In so far as that revolution of Christian thought... has been peacefully and happily conducted during the last twenty years, English theology is in no small degree indebted to Dr. Campbell..... He has done much to aid the sorely needed reconciliation between the past and present, between the old and the new...." "It would be difficult to find any writings which combine in anything like an equal degree, candour, fairness, sympathy, boldness and depth. Would that we could add to these priceless characteristics, lucidity of style!"¹

Thus we find that somehow, despite all the criticism theologians now and again hurled at Campbell from the Row days

1 - Contemporary Review June 1878.

until even recent years, his influence has nevertheless followed on its course. Campbell's contribution has by some been brushed aside, "But the majestic river floated onward", to utilize one of Matthew Arnold's lines. For many years men who have received a new birth of spiritual vigor, have marked its date with the reading of John M'Leod Campbell. To one who studies Campbell, the reason for that influence is obvious.

"Light songs we breathe that perish with our breath
Out of our lips that have not kissed the rod.
They shall not live who have not tasted death,
They only sing who are struck dumb by God."

Bibliography.

- Memorials of John M'Leod Campbell, edited by Rev. Donald Campbell, 2 vols. 1877. This is an indispensable source containing about one thousand letters, covering the whole period from the days of Row down to the time of Campbell's death. pub. Macmillan.
- Reminiscences and Reflections, J. M'Leod Campbell, 1873, Macmillan. This is the last work written by Campbell. Death came before the book was finished.
- Thoughts on Revelation, J. M'Leod Campbell, 2nd ed. 1874, Macmillan (Edinburgh Public Library)
- Sermons of J. M'Leod Campbell, Shorthand Notes, 2 vols. 1832 published by R.B. Lusk, Greenock. (New College Library Edinburgh)
- Sermons of J. M'Leod Campbell ; a collection of sermon pamphlets and sermon notes 1829-1830 (New College Library Edinburgh)
- Christ the Bread of Life, J.M'Leod Campbell, 2nd ed. 1869, Macmillan. (The copy used in this study was loaned through the courtesy of Rev. J.M'Leod Campbell of Hertford College, Oxford)
- Fragments of Truth, J.M'Leod Campbell, 4th ed. Edinburgh 1898, David Douglas. This volume has had an interesting history, and its authenticity has been questioned. However, there is sufficient evidence to show that Campbell accepted this as his own. The volume was originally published anonymously as "Fragments of Exposition". It is made up of notes of sermons and lectures of Dr. Campbell, and includes also a very few of Erskine's and A.J. Scott's discourses. The book was issued by Miss Jane Gourlay, who took most of the notes. Miss Gourlay was a friend of the Campbell family. Correspondence with Mrs. Wright, the surviving daughter of Dr. Campbell, has shown that this volume met with her father's approval and was accepted by him. A further evidence of this will be found in a letter of Principal Shairp of St. Andrews a quotation from which will be found on page 320a of this thesis. And finally, in a letter in Memorials vol. 1, p. 243, Dr. Campbell refers by name to this book, saying he was pleased that Charles Kingsley was enjoying the reading of it. This reference by Campbell's own hand should place the authenticity of the book beyond dispute.
- This book is of value in showing the development of Campbell's thought from the close of the Trial 1831, to the publication of "The Nature of the Atonement" 1856.

The Nature of the Atonement, J.M'Leod Campbell, 1st ed.1856, 6th ed.1886, 3rd reprint of 6th ed.1915. pub. Macmillan.

The Whole Proceedings in the Case of John M'Leod Campbell Before the Presbytery of Dumbarton, and the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr. in Two Parts, published by R.B.Lusk, Greenock 1831. (Library of New College Edinburgh)

A Full Report of the Proceedings in the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in the case of J.M'Leod Campbell on the 24th and 25th of May 1831. pub. R.B.Lusk, Greenock 1831.

Pamphlets Concerning the Row Heresy - New College Library Edinburgh. The most important among these are:

1. Universal Redemption, a truth according to the Scriptures, defended from the misrepresentations and calumnies contained in a late pamphlet entitled, The Gareloch Heresy Tried.

2. The Gareloch Heresy Tried. A. Robertson.

3. A Vindication of the Religion of the Land. Rev. Robert Burns.

Calvin's Institutes

Shedd, Calvinism Pure and Mixed

Hastie, Theology of the Reformed Church, Croall Lectures.

Kuyper, Calvinism, the Stone Lectures at Princeton 1898

Edward Fisher, The Marrow of Modern Divinity, Thomas Boston ed. Edinburgh 1827 (Tolbooth Parish Church Library)

Pamphlets in several volumes on the Marrow Controversy - Tolbooth Parish Church Library.

Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland - Tolbooth Parish Church Library.

Robert Herbert Story, Memoir of Robert Story

A. F. Mitchell, The Westminster Assembly, Baird Lectures 1882

C. G. M'Crie, Confessions of the Church of Scotland

A. M. Hunter, The Teaching of Calvin

Donald Macleod, Memoir of Norman Macleod

W. Hanna, Life of Dr. Chalmers

W. Hanna, Letters of Thomas Erskine, 2nd ed. Edinburgh 1878

- H.F.Henderson, Erskine of Linlathen: Selections and Biography,
Edinburgh 1899
- Oliphant, Life of Edward Irving, 3rd ed. London 1864
- J.H.Leckie, Fergus Ferguson, His Theology and Heresy Trial.
- Principal Tulloch, Movements of Religious Thought, St. Giles
Lectures 1885
- Wm. Knight, Principal Shairp and His Friends
- A.J.Ross, Memoir of Alexander Ewing, Bishop of Argyll and the
Isles.
- Luther, Sermons on the Most Interesting Doctrines of the Gospel,
pub. James Duncan, London 1830, reprint of 1581 ed.
- Luther's Commentary on Galatians
- Wace and Buchheim, Luther's Primary Works
- W. Herrmann, Communion with God
- Adolph Harnack, History of Dogma, 7 vols.
- Reinhold Seeberg, History of Doctrine, 2 vols. pub. by Lutheran
Publication Company, Philadelphia, U.S.A.
- A.C.McGiffert, Protestant Thought Before Kant
- Principal Cunningham, Reformers and the Theology of the
Reformation
- L.A.Weigle, Repentance, Holman Foundation Lecture
- Schleiermacher, Christliche Glaube.
- W.B.Selbie, Schleiermacher
- George Cross, The Theology of Schleiermacher
- Oman's translation of the Reden
- Pfleiderer, Development of Theology Since Kant
- Lichtenberger, History of German Theology in the 19th Century
- Ritschl, Justification and Reconciliation (E.T. 1900)
- A.E.Garvie, The Ritschlian Theology
- James Orr, The Ritschlian Theology

- A.T.Swing, Theology of Albrecht Ritschl
- T.E.Crawford, The Scripture Doctrine of the Atonement
- R.W.Dale, The Atonement
- J. Denney, The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation
The Death of Christ
- James Orr, The Christian View of God and the world
- A.B.Bruce, The Humiliation of Christ
- R.C.Moberly, Atonement and Personality
- W.H.Moberly, The Atonement, in Foundations 1912
- J.K.Mozley, The Doctrine of the Atonement
- Wm. Newton Clark, An Outline of Christian Theology
- Wm. Adams Brown, Christian Theology in Outline
- G.G.Stevens, The Christian Doctrine of salvation
- T.V.Tymms, The Christian idea of the Atonement
- Hastings Rashdall, The idea of Atonement in Christian Theology
Conscience and Christ
Jesus Human and Divine 1922
- J.Dick Fleming, Redemption
- T. Haering, The Christian Faith (E.T.1913) 2 vols.
- Robert Mackintosh, Historic Theories of the Atonement
- Auguste Sabatier, The Doctrine of the Atonement (E.T.1904)
- H.R.Mackintosh, The Person of Jesus Christ
- W. M'Dowall, Evolution and Atonement
- C.A.Dinsmore, Atonement in Literature and Life
- The Atonement in Modern Religious Thought, A Theological
Symposium 1900
- D. white, Forgiveness and Suffering
- J.W.Wilson, The Gospel of the Atonement
- Horace Bushnell, vicarious Sacrifice
Forgiveness and Law

D.C.Mackintosh, Theology as an Empirical Science

Principal John Caird, The Fundamentals of Christianity, Gifford
Lectures 2 vols.

Borden P.Bowne, Studies in Christianity

H.R.Mackintosh, Some Aspects of Christian Belief

Oxenham, Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement.

References to Campbell in Periodical Literature

Literary Churchman, March 8, 1856.

Blackwoods, September 1877, vol 122, p.283.

Edinburgh Review, April 1878.

Glasgow Herald, April 30, 1868.

The Spectator, April 3, 1869.

National Review, April 1856.

Contemporary Review, June 1878.

Good words, vol. for 1872, p.353ff.

Andover Review, vol. 17 p.549ff, vol.18 p.591ff.

Expositor, January and February 1921, and May 1923.